



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

**Written Feedback**

**Hibiscus and Bays Volume #2**

April 2024



<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Organisation Name</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
6817	Pinewoods Holiday Park	1479
7163	Tennis Northern	1782



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

There needs to be a trade-off. Council wastes an eye-watering amount of money on frivolities, including all-but unused cycle-ways and a non-existent 'climate emergency'. Stop wasting money and money will be freed up for other priorities.

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



**#3755**



Stop wasting money on cycle-ways, which are a sop to a tiny, vocal minority and most of which go completely unused.

Stop wasting money on 'climate' initiatives, most of which are meaningless virtue-signaling.

Stop wasting money on sops to the DEI brigade, like painting rainbows everywhere.

Stop wasting money on duplication of services. There's no reason why CCOs are anything more than shop-fronts. Duplicating back-office services - HR, Finance, IT, etc. is a complete waste of ratepayer money.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Cycle-ways are an expensive waste of money. AT needs to fire all of the anti-car religious zealots and provide a transport network that works for Auckland. That means roads, including buses, and ferries. And please, stop with the electrification nonsense. It costs more than Auckland can afford.

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

If anything, spend more on ferries - including retaining and improving the Gulf Harbour service. Money for that should come from efficiencies elsewhere, NOT from additional ratepayer gouging.

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

Almost everything, but specifically cycle-ways. Ideally, CRL would never have been approved as it's a gigantic white elephant but it's now a sunk cost so get it finished as quickly and cheaply as possible.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management



**#3755**



**Tell us why:**

The devil is in the detail - it depends on what is meant by 'change the operational 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)?**

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:**

It depends on the value of the dividends and council's financial position at the time. If using dividends to fund (core) council services means lower rates increased, then that should be the preference.

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

**Tell us here:**



#3755



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

Other

**Tell us why:**

The ferry basin and inner harbour are already substantially congested, particularly during cruise ship season. If developing Captain Cook & Marsden for 'other purposes' results in further congestion and a greater impact on commuter ferry operations, it should not be considered.

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

See above

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

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to	Do not support



#3755



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

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

Since amalgamation, times have been good and money (essentially) free. Council during that time has proven itself a poor steward of ratepayer money, spending on frivolities at the expense of core service delivery. Stop wasting money on things that are not core.



#3755



## 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.	Fairly Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Not Important



#3755



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?**

I support much of the proposal, but 'invest in climate change response initiatives' is very vague and needs expanding. If it's some kind of panic in response to a mythical 'climate emergency' then \$0 should be allocated. If it's things like planting riparian waterways to slow erosion, then sure.

**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?**

Since amalgamation, times have been good and money (essentially) free. Council during that time has proven itself a poor steward of ratepayer money, spending on frivolities at the expense of core service delivery. Stop wasting money on things that are not core.

You've spent all of the money and maxed out the debt limit. Stop spending so much on garbage, and focus on core 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?

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?

Climate adaptation and mitigation projects in particular cycleways and public transport.

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



Road building and maintenance.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need more cycleways and pedestrian crossings.

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

Cycleways and pedestrian crossings.

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

Car infrastructure.

**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:**

Normally I would not support privatising public assets, but airports are not comparable with the carbon reduction needs of the future. We need a fund to support climate risks as they are realised.



#3757



**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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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

Support



#3757



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#3757



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



#3757



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**

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

Improving cycleways and connections between them and building parks.

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

The promised funding for the development of the Pohewa Rd reserve in the East Coast Heights community must be delivered and the reserve built. I live in the community with 4 young people. Our neighbourhood is absolutely full of children and teens who need a place to play. We as a community need a place to gather and hold community events. The area is starved for trees and greenery. Please build this reserve quickly to enhance the quality of life for the residents who live in this medium density development. We are rate payers too and our children need a safe place to play.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

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

NO

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



**#3780**



DO NOT WASTE MONEY CHANGING ENGLISH SIGNAGE, PARKS, ETC ETC TO MAORI

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

MUCH TOO MUCH MONEY SPENT IN PAST SPENT ON CYCLE WAYS, ROAD BUMPS, SPEED CHANGES

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

CHANGING SPEEDS BACK TO SENSIBLE SPEED

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

CHANGING EVERYTHING TO MAORI SIGNAGE, CONSULTATION, HUI'S ETC

WE ARE OE PEOPLE, ENGLISH IS THE MOST SPOKEN, UNDERSTOOD LANGUAGE.

DANGER SIGNS ONLY IN MAORI ARE RIDICULOUS

**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



**#3780**



**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:**

A FOOTBALL FIELD IN THE MIDDLE OF THE CITY IS RIDICULOUS DUE TO CONGESTION

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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



#3780



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

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#3780



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#3780



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**

FIX THE POTHOLES! CHANGE SPEED LIMITS BACK TO WHAT THEY WERE. NO MORE MAORI SIGNAGE OR HOURS CONSULTING MAORI

**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	As 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 frequent bus services between CBD and Orewa. The cost of taxis/ubers later in the evening is prohibitive and means we just don't go out after work or on the weekends



**#3786**



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

Get rid of the "Food Scraps" service. You did an appalling job of "selling" it to the community and I'm sure you know that a lot of households already compost. This should be an opt-in service. If not enough "opt-ins" to make it viable - simple - just STOP and admit it wasn't the best idea. Or explain to us WHY it is saving us Ratepayers money. Still don't understand why we have it.

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

If common sense has returned and we spend money in the RIGHT places (NOT raised pedestrian crossing/painting roads and pavements and then returning and removing the paint on said roads and pavements/"street furniture" like the trees in Northcroft Street in Takapuna that were decimated by the wind tunnel and eventually removed as well), then I believe we are on the right track. Think of it as spending your OWN money please.

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

Bus Frequency between CBD and North Auckland - happy to spend double the "daytime" fare for a night service that runs more frequently.

Eventhough I don't currently use it, the Gulf Harbour ferry service is very important to that community and hopefully "common sense" prevails with this.

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

Anything that is a "nice to have" as opposed to a "Must have"

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management



**#3786**



**Tell us why:**

Reading your stats on NHS use/patronage is a sad picture. Common sense would say that something has to change to make use of this investment in a much better way. Just a point though - do buses go to the stadium directly or does one need to walk from Albany (15 mins walk according to google which is too long for a lot of people and may be the reason for underuse?)

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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'm no financial wizard and would have to understand the pros and cons. I believe that a country should own certain assets and not be beholden to a private company. Sorry - not very helpful.

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 just sounds 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:**

Again, a sensible idea.



#3786



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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

I've tried to understand the options but don't feel comfortable enough to give a considered opinion. The \$110m investment bothers me as I'm not entirely sure where this funding will come from. I assume that we have professionals at Council who will make the right decisions.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

I've tried to understand the options but don't feel comfortable enough to give a considered opinion. The \$110m investment bothers me as I'm not entirely sure where this funding will come from. I assume that we have professionals at Council who will make the right decisions.

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

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#3786



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



#3786



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



#3786



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**

Please, please, please make sure that the Gulf Harbour Country Club golf course is NOT permitted to be sold for development. You have to uphold the 1000-year encumbrance on the golf course land. That's why we have a local board to ensure that Council understands the community concerns.

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

Very wishy-washy commentary. Not inspiring at all. Where does crime fit in to all of these initiatives? All very well to focus on parks, recreation, transport when a lot of the premises that have these facilities are being taken over by criminal behaviour and deterring the community from using them in the first place. Seems all disjointed in that "my community" has a very serious crime problem yet it isn't mentioned anywhere. I don't care that "policing" is not part of Auckland Council....once again.....common sense - without a holistic view of the community, it's all smoke and mirrors. I'd like to see my rates going into crime prevention first and foremost.

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

The most important areas for me and where I'd choose for my rates to be spent:

Crime Prevention

Upholding the 1000-year encumbrance on Gul Harbour's golf course land

Ensuring a regular and affordable ferry service from Gulf Harbour

Improved CBD to Orewa bus services at night (happy to pay more for night time fares if necessary)



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

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

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

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



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?**



#3827



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3827



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

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



#3827



## 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	Fairly Important



#3827



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?

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

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

Not at this stage until the inflation is settled.

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

Recreation and community services



**#3845**



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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

There are lot of unnecessary spending such as crossing, cycle path etc. Please stop this, just maintain the roads.

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

Spend more on water especially consider recycling of water. The stormwater collected from the system should be recycled.

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

Recreation, community support.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

Consider renewal in 5-10 years

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

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

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



**#3845**



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

Please try to maintain status quo until the inflation is reduced.

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

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



#3845



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

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



#3845



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

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

This survey was not user friendly, please try to shorten the survey next time.

**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
---	------------------



#3845



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?**

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 less (reduce 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	As 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?**

less consultation fee for nothing constructed.

**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:**



#3848



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#3848



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



**#3848**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Keep North Harbour stadium as is

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



**#3867**



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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

We need to get more apartment complexes built so more people want to live in the city and close by transport hubs they do overseas to reduce traffic. Less rural land development which will only increase the traffic using motorways and suburban streets.

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

D

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

We believe it is an under used asset and more sports should be encouraged to use the facilities by offering incentives.

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

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

### Tell us why:



**#3867**



There is no reason to believe that the income from the sale will be more than the income from the assets. I also dont trust this or futurre councils to not spend the fund unwisely.

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

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

**Tell us here:**

There is no reason to believe that the income from the sale will be more than the income from the assets. I also dont trust this or futurre councils to not spend the fund unwisely.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The profits should be included in the budget for the annual 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?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#3867



Keep Captain Cook wharf. Long term lease Marsden so Council still owns the land but develop the area. Not tower blocks should be built on the land. Restrictions on use should be carefully thought through.

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#3867



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

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

### 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



#3867



**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 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**

Our creeks continue to pollute the beaches every time there is a storm so more protection of waterways is needed.

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



**#3867**



Partially supported.

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

Be more efficient



**#3869**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is bad and will always be bad. Because of the geography

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

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

politicians salaries

**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:**

Loss of Control: I'm concerned that transferring the shares to the fund could mean that we lose direct control over these assets. Fund managers could sell the shares, which might not align with our interests or the public's interests.

Market Risks: I'm worried about the market risks associated with this proposal. The fund's value would be subject to market fluctuations, and if the fund's investments do not perform well, they could lose value.



**#3869**



Dependence on Fund Performance: I'm apprehensive about our financial resilience becoming more dependent on the fund's performance. If the fund does not generate the expected returns, it could impact our ability to fund services and initiatives.

Potential for Short-Term Focus: I'm wary of the potential for a short-term focus. While the fund is intended to focus on long-term financial resilience, there could be pressure to focus on short-term gains, especially if we face financial pressures.

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

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

##### **Tell us here:**

**\*\*Financial Gain:** The lease could generate an upfront payment of around \$2.1 billion. This substantial sum could be invested in the Auckland Future Fund, yielding significant returns.

2. **\*\*Rate Stabilization\*\*:** I see the potential for the upfront payment to help lessen the rate increase for year two of the long-term plan to the proposed 3.5 per cent. This could make a significant difference to Auckland's ratepayers.

5. **\*\*Flexibility\*\*:** I value that the lease would be subject to several conditions to help progress the council's ownership objectives for the port. This could allow the council to ensure that the port operations align with its strategic goals.

#### **4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:**



#3869



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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#3869



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

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

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?

Provide a first class public transport system. With Max \$2 trip fares - to get people on the buses etc. Start/complete Eastern & Western Busway. Also, provide a repairs & maintenance 10 year plan and funds for all citywide assets. Stadiums, parks, water pavements etc.

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



**#3891**



Check proficiency of management & staff to ensure they are capable of doing their jobs. Like, "How many people needed to change a light bulb". We need people who are goal orientated, set tasks, have timelines & are accountable. & have the same goal orientated people checking up on tasks to make sure its done.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

No more raised pedestrian crossings- they actually hurt my back (recently as a passenger in a car) there must be others effected in this way.

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

Cheap efficient busways. good public transportation & links.

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

Raised pedestrian crossings.

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

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

### **Tell us why:**

Auckland City has let the North Shore and Albany Stadium down by the seeming lack of interest in the building its position within the city north to Wellsford. With local & city interest could be an asset well into the future. At the moment it is an Auckland City shame. It was built by North Shore people and left by AC who preferred to concentrate on other areas. Albany Stadium has been used in advertising for the North Shore the same as Sky City for Auckland, and yet AC apparently cannot see its worth. Also the majority of local people are completely unaware of what could be intended.



**#3891**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 sell the family silver it has gone for good. An Insurance type fund could be put aside from rates to cover disasters which may occur in the future. a few cents per person x Auckland population could add up to a tidy sum each year. No need to sell anything.

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

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

**Tell us here:**

A properly run port of NZ is better than any over seas company. AC just needs to ensure that the port is run properly so that the dividends keeps coming through. Needs good management.

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I am unsure of what Council Services means or covers. If its for wages then ?? but if its for citywide infrastructure then that's another matter entirely. Also looking at long term maintenance plan and having funds available.

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



#3891



Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

I dont know anything about this or the effects, but I do not want to see huge trucks continuing to use our roads in the City and would like to see the use of more trains to our inland port. also, I do not wish to see the area used for a Stadium. We already have two on the waterfront, I do not want to see a bigger one.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

Same as 5a. The Port and where it goes needs to be sorted. Every option does not appear to answer this question which was very relevant 4 years ago. what has changed.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3891



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



#3891



## 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.	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.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important



**#3891**



### **Tell us why**

A lot of time & money has been spent in West Harbour yet the Board has not planned for upkeep on existing public parks, eg fruit trees Lakes Area at Westfield or Hooton Reserve- not even a park bench to sit on. Clearing & pruning. Apple trees at Hub. Ne

### **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?**

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?**

As I have no information on this matter I cannot judge. We may need a new library but what & where is the land is the Council is wishing to sell? and where are you intending a new library should be built?

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

Every employee must be accountable. Every elected Representative needs to be accountable. Representatives also need to attend meetings be responsible and be involved in local affairs for which they were elected.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

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

More focus on roads and less focus on public transport. Stop putting in crossings and wasting our money

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



**#3902**



Less funding of events that are targeted at specific socio or cultural groups.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Things need to be looked at from a more sensical view, AT's decisions over the past few years have been bizarre. Clearly rate payers have not been consulted.

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

Spend more on important road infrastructure and projects such as Glenvar road, especially ones that have been highlighted as safety risks.

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

Dynamic lanes are unrealistic and not practical in reality. Albany highway for instance, there is no one in the 2 people lane, because the reality is people travel to work alone.

Apple and Google pay, we should be focussing on important projects and not wasting funds on new technology that doesn't have vast improvements over the current system. Hop cards work fine.

Stop wasting money on investigations and consulting firms. and just do it and try it - Bicycle ferry.

Saving costs for Auckland transport - look at the organisation itself. Who is making wasteful decisions such as the speed bumps at pedestrian crossing. Non-sensical decisions have created most of the problems. Look internally and hire the correct people that can efficiently direct the projects.

Charge for park and ride - why encourage people to use public transport if you then going to charge them to park at park and rides. The feeder buses are too far apart and slow, what can take a half hour trip in a car, becomes a 1 and half hour trip on a bus. please don't charge people to park at park and ride.



**#3902**



**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:**

Seem smart to diversify

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

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

No



#3902



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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3902



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

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

No

## Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays



#3902



## 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 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



**#3902**



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

Good, all agreed

**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?

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

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

More focus on roads and less focus on public transport. Stop putting in crossings and wasting our money



**#3905**



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

Less funding of events that are targeted at specific socio or cultural groups.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Things need to be looked at from a more sensical view, AT's decisions over the past few years have been bizarre.

Clearly rate payers have not been consulted.

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

Spend more on important road infrastructure and projects such as Glenvar road, especially ones that have been

highlighted as safety risks.

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

Dynamic lanes are unrealistic and not practical in reality. Albany highway for instance, there is noone in the 2 people

lane, because the reality is people travel to work alone.

Apple and Google pay, we should be focussing on important projects and not wasting funds on new technology that

doesn't have vast improvements over the current system. Hop cards work fine.

Stop wasting money on investigations and consulting firms. and just do it and try it - Bicycle ferry.

Saving costs for Auckland transport - look at the organisation itself. Who is making wasteful decisions such as the

speed bumps at pedestrian crossing. Non sensical decisions have created most of the problems. Look internally and



**#3905**



hire the correct people that can efficiently direct the projects.

Charge for park and ride - why encourage people to use public transport if you then going to charge them to park at

park and rides. The feeder busses are too far apart and slow, what can take a half hour trip in a car, becomes a 1 and

half hour trip on a bus. please don't charge people to park at park and ride.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

#### **Tell us why:**

N/A

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

Proceed with the proposal

#### **Tell us why:**

Seem smart to diversify

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

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

#### **Tell us here:**



#3905



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 dont want the funds squandered

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

**Tell us here:**

No

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#3905



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



#3905



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

**6b. Do you have 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,	Fairly Important



#3905



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?**

Good, all agreed

**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?

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

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

More focus on roads and less focus on public transport. Stop putting in crossings and wasting our money



**#3908**



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

Less funding of events that are targeted at specific socio or cultural groups.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Things need to be looked at from a more sensical view, AT's decisions over the past few years have been bizarre.

Clearly rate payers have not been consulted.

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

Spend more on important road infrastructure and projects such as Glenvar road, especially ones that have been

highlighted as safety risks.

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

Dynamic lanes are unrealistic and not practical in reality. Albany highway for instance, there is noone in the 2 people

lane, because the reality is people travel to work alone.

Apple and Google pay, we should be focussing on important projects and not wasting funds on new technology that

doesn't have vast improvements over the current system. Hop cards work fine.

Stop wasting money on investigations and consulting firms. and just do it and try it - Bicycle ferry.

Saving costs for Auckland transport - look at the organisation itself. Who is making wasteful decisions such as the



**#3908**



speed bumps at pedestrian crossing. Non sensical decisions have created most of the problems. Look internally and

hire the correct people that can efficiently direct the projects.

Charge for park and ride - why encourage people to use public transport if your then going to charge them to park at

park and rides. The feeder busses are to far apart and slow, what can take a half hour trip in a car, becomes a 1 and

half hour trip on a bus. please dont charge people to park at park and ride.

### **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:**

Seem smart to diversify

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#3908



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 don't the money frivolously spent

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

**Tell us here:**

NO

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#3908



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



#3908



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

**6b. Do you have 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,	Not Important



#3908



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?**

All 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3921**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways although they seem to get brick bats. If there was a proper network and you weren't forced onto main roads consistently people would use them more. Not only that they can actually be a tourist attraction when built well.

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

cycleways

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

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

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



#3921



Tell us 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



#3921



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



#3921



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

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Not Important



#3921



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Cutting grass and weeding in public areas so that the city looks tidy. Solving the problem of homeless people living on Queen St. Improving security on public transport so passengers and drivers can travel safely.

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



Less investment in public events like parades and festivals.

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I am opposed to congestion charges on the motorway system.

I am opposed to charging for park and rides.

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

Starting work on a second harbour crossing.

Increasing parking capacity at Park and Rides.

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

Cycleways.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

I enjoy going to sporting events such as The FIFA Under 20 World Cup games and Rugby Test matches at North Harbour Stadium. I would like to see North Harbour Stadium used as a concert venue also. If Auckland gets an A League football club, I would like it to be based at North Harbour stadium.

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



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

**Tell us why:**

I would like Auckland council to retain its remaining shares in Auckland airport because Auckland Airport is an important transport hub for our city.

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 it's important for the city to retain control of the workings of 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:**

I think the Future Fund is a good idea to make our city more resilient 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?**

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



#3944



**Tell us why:**

A working port is an important utility for our city.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

The port is an important part of our transport chain.

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

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



#3944



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#3944



**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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Keeping our beaches and green spaces clean and healthy is important because these are the places where we use our recreation time.

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



**#3944**



OK

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

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

Indoor basketball facilities - made available for school and club use. Exclusively for basketball - not other minor sports. It is the fastest growing sport, and largest by participation - we need more investment, but access needs to be affordable (or free to incorporated clubs)



**#3962**



**1d. Is there anything else 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?**

Subsidise buses so they are the obvious choice! Make using a car the least desirable option. Put on more buses, to more routes. Small buses if needed to cater to smaller communities or less frequented 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, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium needs to be kept and management changed to better promote using it for large events and international acts/sports. I do think redeveloping to a large multi-sport venue is smart though - especially for basketball. Eventfinda is no longer large enough - we need a 10 court facility to even start meeting 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:**



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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Waterfront Stadium! Should have been done decades ago.

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



#3962



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

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



#3962



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

Continue to invest in transport initiatives.

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



Stop building speed bumps. They are expensive and extremely disruptive during the creation of them.

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

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Common sense

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

Fix the pot holes.

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

Raised crossings. Cycle ways.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Under utilised.

Largest stadium on the north shore - why is it not utilised more?

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

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#3979**



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

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



#3979



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

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



#3979



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#3979



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?

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

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

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

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

Harbor bike crossing - just get it done and people will come in hordes.

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



**#3981**



**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:**

Only invest money if bigger events are likely to come

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



#3981



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#3981



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



#3981



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

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



#3981



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

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

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

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



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:**

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



#4003



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4003



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

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



#4003



## 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



#4003



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?

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

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

I would like Council to focus on the basics and getting that done right. Our rates were evaluated when house prices were at an all time high. House prices have dropped but our rates have not, and Council is proposing increases. This is a bit of a kick in the guts.



**#4067**



**1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Public transport is too expensive and too unreliable. I can't see how this can be turned around. Especially options from the North Shore.

**2a. Is there anything you 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?**



**#4067**



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



#4067



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



#4067



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

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	Fairly Important



#4067



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.	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?



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because the council will not deliver any of it on budget. The costs will balloon significantly.

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

Build another harbour crossing

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

Get rid of the bureaucrats and expensive consultants

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Albany needs a sporting precinct like 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)?**

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?**



**#4074**



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

**Tell us here:**

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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



#4074



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



#4074



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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	Fairly Important



#4074



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 less (reduce 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?

No



**#4079**



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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

It's labour intensive to read the entirety of the document and, in my opinion, unfair to expect this of the citizens of Auckland who have no expertise in the areas they are being asked for feedback on. So I have not read the section on transport. Ultimately, my desire is for Auckland council to spend less and do less broadly. The cost of living in this city is exceptionally high and any reductions on the burden being past to the average person is my desire for the council's long term plans.

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

No

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

No

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

-

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

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



**#4079**



**Tell us why:**

I understand the intention but even considering this type of proposal is a cost to the average citizen without any clear gain attached. It's also, as mentioned in my previous answers, another episode of the public being asked for their view on something they have no expertise on.

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 would like to see ownership retained and no lease take place as, if I am reading this right, then the council will get the most ongoing profit (although without the upfront cash injection of the lease). I would also like to see services reduced to compensate and still allow the lower rates rises (the ultimate desire of my feedback).

Unfortunately, I am jaded in my view of the councils competence with money (and not without recent evidence), and I don't believe the cash injection that could be received from leasing would be reinvested in a way that would compensate for the lost dividends. I believe it would be allocated in a way that would result in an overall loss from the lease over the 35 year period.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 want the council to get to a point where it runs a surplus and then use that money to grow investment. The first step is funding itself and running a surplus.

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

**Tell us here:**



#4079



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:**

Seems like a significant cost for uncertain gain. The cost of additional shipping to Auckland by rail or truck as a consequence stands out as particularly painful in terms of inefficiency and climate cost.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

As above.

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

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



#4079



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

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

Some of the questions above are very poorly worded.



#4079



For example, "Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other rate payers. We also propose to raise share businesses of the NETR, WQTR, CATTR to align with the general rate"

Because of a lack of grammar in the question, I can read this multiple different ways, I could read that discontinuing the LDS will gradually lower the share of general rates paid by businesses ... or I could read that the LDS will gradually lower the share ... and that discontinuing it would therefore mean that general rates paid by business will not lower.

Then the question ends with a bunch of other commentary ... "We also propose to raise share businesses of the NETR, WQTR, CATTR to align with the general rate", now I'm not sure what I am clicking "support" or "do not support" to because we have introduced all these other elements at the end which I might be responding to.

Probably should have cleaned these up before putting them out for consultation. Something like - "Do you support or not support LDS? If the LDS is not supported (and discontinued) it will mean X, if it is supported, it would be Y"

## 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



#4079



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.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

This part of the document is not very transparent as what "supporting" something means is not defined ... so I can only give the general feedback of supporting these things is fairly important.

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

Fine. I would particularly like an emphasis on swimable beaches and water quality in that area.

**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?

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	
Council support	Do 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:**

The thing I feel is that it is all very well spending money but it appears to only be spent in a small area of the Auckland region and percentage wise across the whole Auckland area.

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

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

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#4094



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4094



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



#4094



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



#4094



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	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?

Improve public transport, Ferries especially to Gulf Harbour

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

Less cultural activities, these should be self funding.



**#4162**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycle lanes are grossly underused, Speed bumps don't work and cause frustration along with raised pedestrian crossings.

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

Car parking in the CBD

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

Cycle lanes

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The stadium should be self funded

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

A safety buffer for the future expenditure.



**#4162**



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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Ports are not key Council business.

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



#4162



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

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



#4162



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

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



#4162



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**

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

Support

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

The inefficient wasteful spending needs to stop. Every single council for as long as I can remember has campaigned on this and failed to delivery. Be the council that uses our hard-earned money wisely.



**#4177**



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

### Tell us why:

Totally insane the trains stopped running due to warm weather. There are plenty of countries in the world that have hot days and trains!!

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

Fixed pot holes

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

Bus lanes, bike lanes, speed humps, consistently changing speed limits.

## 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?**



#4177



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4177



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

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

Ditch any spending to do with "climate change"

## Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays



#4177



## 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.	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**



**#4177**



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	
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
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?

Road cone reduction

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

Vanity projects



**#4218**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

eliminate some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.stop the war on cars

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

Basic requirements

**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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#4218



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?**

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



#4218



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



#4218



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

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Not Important



#4218



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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support 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?**



#4235



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4235



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

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



#4235



## 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	Fairly Important



#4235



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	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

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

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

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



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#4238



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



#4238



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



#4238



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

### 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	Not Important



#4238



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?**

## 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.	Not Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Not Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Fairly Important
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	Fairly Important



#4238



Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Not Important
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

Free public transport

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



**#4252**



Less investment in roads

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

we need less roads and more public transport

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

Public transport

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

New roads

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

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

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is under used. Could be used for concerts and music events. I want to see this event stadium busy every week end.

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

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

**Tell us why:**



**#4252**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

move the port to Northland and develop the port land into housing and retail.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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



#4252



don't wait 15 years do it this year

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

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



#4252



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

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

Move to 3 Waters not council controlled waters.

## 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
---	----------------



#4252



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**

**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?

To many bus running around empty what a wast



**#4256**



**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?**

No

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

Buses

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#4256



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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



#4256



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



#4256



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

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Very Important



#4256



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?**

## 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	Very Important



#4256



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.	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.	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**

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?

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?

Just do the core council responsibilities competently and efficiently, i.e. Water provision and waste disposal, rubbish disposal, local roading and public transportation.

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

Less bureaucracy, less on feel good cultural handouts. These events etc should be paid for by their own communities. This includes arts. Pacifica and the like.



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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Cycleways are a waste of ratepayer money. Make the developers pay for cycleways. Current cycleways are rarely used to get to work. Auckland geography and weather and not even e-bikes. The lycra brigade talks a lot but don't use their bikes to commute to work. They are weekend casual users. E-scooters are a menace to life and limb and to ACC.

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

Infrastructure.

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

Cultural activities and Eke Panuku which is just another bloated overpaid group of "planners".

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

At the moment it's 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#4278**



I've never seen a sound financial argument for their retention by Council.

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

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

**Tell us here:**

Get someone in with business acumen to run the Port. Council is not not for business sense.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

This Future seem to be in the real of fantasy.

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

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 the Port operation is to be leased then don't hamstring the the lessee.

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



#4278



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



#4278



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

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

No

## Local board priorities

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

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	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#4278



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.	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.	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.	Fairly Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

While I support waste minimisation I do not support proposals to cut back rubbish collections. This is completely counter productive to a rubbish free environment. Pressure Central Govt to have food and consumer goods suppliers reduce plastic and non recy

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



**#4278**



Some are OK some not.

**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?**

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 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?

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4280**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The gulf harbour ferry is a let down. Fares increase while service decreases. By increasing ferry crossings membership will increase which should alleviate the need to increase costs. We are also Aucklanders, we pay our rates, yet we get completely left behind in terms of transport.

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

Gulf harbour ferry services

**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)?**

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#4280



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4280



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

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



#4280



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important



#4280



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?**

Don't forget us up north, we need the gulf harbour ferry to continue to operate, at useable 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?

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?

Flood-proof at-risk areas.

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



**#4285**



**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:**



#4285



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#4285



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



#4285



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

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#4285



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?**



#4318

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#4318



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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

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



#4318



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



#4318



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



#4318



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?**



#4327

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Review parking costs/fines in this city. Open up Auckland central and provide free parking



**#4327**



**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:**



#4327



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#4327



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



#4327



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

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



#4327



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**

**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?**



#4332

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This is what you were meant to do 5 years ago and it never happened.

Also hiking outer harbour pricing is not acceptable and will kill the services. I write this as I'm on the 7am gulf harbour ferry D7, with a packed vessel (only about five seats downstairs empty). The community need this service to get around Auckland. Without it, the roads on the hibiscus coast will be unusable due to the increase in vehicles on the 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:**

This stadium has been underused for years, and also loses over a million dollars a year in opex. The amount of Capex needed to improve the facility and keep up with upkeep is too high (i.e: the roof needs to be redone let alone an internal upgrade and dealing with the leaks).

Putting a small trust arena style venue in place will be more cost effective and used by 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)?**

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



**#4332**



**Tell us why:**

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

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



#4332



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

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



#4332



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

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



#4332



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.	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	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:**

To get more use out of it. It is too big to accommodate our sports on a regular basis.

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



#4337



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#4337



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



#4337



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

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



#4337



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?

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

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

RC BC CONSENT NEED MORE EFFICIENCY.

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

BUINDING INSPECTUON NEED MORE EFFICIENCY



**#4339**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#4339



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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



#4339



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



#4339



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

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



#4339



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?

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?

Don't support any of the proposal



**#4340**



**Tell us why:**

The outer ferry services need to have more investment to take more cars off the road, there isnt enough space to expand the road network off the Hibiscus coast but there are houses going up daily.

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

Ferry services

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

No but I think priority shld go to easing congestion therefore road maintenance would not be required as frequently

**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?**



#4340



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4340



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays



#4340



## 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
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



**#4340**



The more attractive the coast is, the better our local economy can grow

**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	As proposed

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

No

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

Get rid of the food bin, it is useless and a waste of money



**#4365**



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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't use public transport

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

No

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

No

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

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

**Tell us why:**

I haven't seen any advertising for events in the past 7 years at the stadium. It is wasteful not to use it for concerts, rugby matches, fun fairs 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)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't trust the council



**#4365**



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

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

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

If you maintain what you have now and implement small improvements along the way you won't need a 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#4365



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4365



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4365



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?

I don’t know

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

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

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

Very few of us can afford anymore . Perhaps you should start cutting some of the large council salaries

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



I do not need a weekly bin collection . I should only pay for what I use i.e. , recycling is only put out once a month , my rubbish fortnightly at the most . I also do not think I should have to pay over a \$1000 a year as a single home owner for supplying my own water by being on tank !!!

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Unfair to cap some ferry users and not everyone therefore I am not in support

### 2a. Is there anything you 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:

We need an events centre on 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?



#4366



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4366



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



#4366



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



#4366



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?

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



**#4383**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

No

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

No

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I agree with the reasons outlined in the document

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to find better ways to fund the many Akld needs including being to provide for current & future improvements. We need to be wise about how we use our assets

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



**#4383**



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

**Tell us here:**

Provide an alternative income stream

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

No, it's difficult for me to fully understand & therefore provide 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:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**



#4383



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

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



#4383



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4383



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?**

Okay

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#4395**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

Cycleway across the bridge

**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:**

Because North Shore ratepayers paid for it and we need a stadium north of the bridge for the east coast bays, Albany, Orewa, Millwater, etc. Just manage it properly or give it back to 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)?**

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



#4395



Tell us 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



#4395



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



**#4395**



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

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

No

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

no



**#4402**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport is a priority for Auckland. We need more funding and improved services for public and roads. Less cycleways because very few people use it and cost a lot of money. Having capped weekly rates for buses will encourage people to use public transport more especially for the NX buses and reduce people's cost of living burden

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

improve public transport

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

stop funding cycleways

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We could redevelop the stadium to facilitate public access even with a small fee, because currently it is not generate any financial benefit or community benefit..

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#4402**



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

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



#4402



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

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



#4402



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4402



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?

Do less (reduce 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?

Get rid of the food scrap bins I didn't want to pay for this - we should be able to opt in or out



**#4405**



**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, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Be great to get more events held here and close to residents on north shore and Rodney areas

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



#4405



Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#4405



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



#4405



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

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



#4405



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.	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 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.	
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people	



#4405



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?

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	
Council support	As 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?



**#4407**



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:**

Much as it hurts to see this facility reduced, it is an underutilised asset that needs work. I'm in favour of selling some of the surrounding land to fund further focussed developments

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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'm not satisfied that sufficient analysis has been completed to justify this 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



#4407



Tell us 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



#4407



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



#4407



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

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#4407



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?

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

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

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

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

Protections for the Hauraki Gulf, as it is over fished and dying.

Massive improvements in public transport.

Support for minority communities, whether blind / deaf / queer / māori / pasifika / other



**#4419**



**1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Reducing bicycle lanes is \*\*\*\*\* stupid. Expanding car lanes is also proven to simply increase traffic jams. Focus on trains and bicycles.

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

Trains, buses, ferries and bicycles.

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

Widening roads.

**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:**

Stop selling off council shares in vital parts of the community



**#4419**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

Stop selling / ;easing off council control of things! All evidence of these sort of partnerships is that outside groups siphon money away from councils.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have 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:**

I don't want to see this area used for a stadium, this seems like an awful idea unless much more investment in public transport and other community building happens.

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

I don't know



#4419



Tell us why:

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

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



#4419



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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
---	----------------



#4419



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?

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, clubs will struggle to continue lifesaving work effectively.

Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks



**#4427**



losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

I 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?**

**Tell us here:**



#4427



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4427



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

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

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



#4427



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

## 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.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones,	Very Important



#4427



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

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

The priorities seem to focus on the Hibiscus Coast more than East Coast Bays. It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including new Surf Lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

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

Maintain roads and water better.

Roads-Make sure the specification for repair of existing roads and new roads is higher and better monitored so any defects are thrown back on the original contractor.



**#4453**



Roads/Planning/Services-The changes to planning and greater density and more parking on roads with inadequate road width and greater probability of accidents requires widening of roads, sacrifice of berms on existing roads. Huge upgrade of storm and sewers as a result of planning density increase.

**1d. Is there anything else 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?**

Speed reduction with raised pedestrian crossings.

**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:**



**#4453**



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

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



#4453



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

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



#4453



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4453



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?**

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

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

No

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

No



**#4455**



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

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Traffic and Public transport issues cost time and money, so we need to make things easier and quicker for people.

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

More Bus services to Hibiscus Coast from City. Either have buses to HBC from Albany only and more often or every 20mins from City to Hibiscus Coast from 1pm in the afternoon. At present 5 buses go to Albany between the Hibiscus buses (which go to Albany), and there is standing room only on the HBC buses. from the City

### 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 a great location, especially with the growth in North Shore/Rodney and if developed right would see more usage and a better patronage.

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



**#4455**



**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:**

No

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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



#4455



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



#4455



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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	Fairly Important



#4455



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.	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?**

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?

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

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

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

Dont install any more speed bumps adn crossings at stupid places... they are lethal, Torbay has a pedestrian crossing right at the round about... do you look for cars or people? Cannot do both at the same time!



Oteha Valley speed bump is insane... far too high and at a traffic light? Come on guys!!!

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Not sure of this one - network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes

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

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

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

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

### Tell us why:

Since its been taken over we have seen way less events and general usage, no wonder its loosing money! It belongs on the North Shore and if it was managed well, it would regain its former glory of hosting huge events like Santana etc again. It is key to our community and hugely important for the younger generations to enjoy for sport, recreation and entertainment. It hasnt been maintained well at all but has the most potential of all the Auckland stadiums to be a successful, well placed location for so much sport and entertainment. Dont take our stadium away and dont sell the land around it!!! There has been no proper consultation around 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)?

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?**

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

**Tell us why:**

Valuable location for a better public use

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



#4486



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

**Tell us why:**

Valuable location for a better public use

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

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



#4486



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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?



#4486



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**

when mana whenua was consulted on the wonderful idea of redeveloping the Long Bay restaurant, we lost it completely!!! Very unfair on all the community that valued this great restaurant and facility!

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

Would be good to have them listed so its easy to read to be honest... I dont know



**#4486**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

Safety investment for more safe Aucklanders for living and working - fight criminals

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



**#4509**



Repairing roads costs too much, I saw that when the road was being repaired, only two people were working, and nearly 20 others were watching or maintaining traffic only.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Second North Shore Bridge more important than any other plan (additional toll highway), more and new viaduct diversion for new highway. Build a second ring highway for Auckland (toll highway for public fundraising)

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

Second North Shore Bridge more important than any other plan (additional toll highway), more and new viaduct diversion for new highway. Build a second ring highway for Auckland (toll highway for public fundraising)

### **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:**

Rented to private users, the purpose is to achieve profits, not taxpayers' blood transfusions. Less than one percent of people will benefit from redeveloping the stadium precinct.

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

Proceed with the proposal



**#4509**



**Tell us why:**

A government that doesn't know how to invest is a very failed government. Don't always focus on taxpayers' money and find some long-term investments, right?

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Compared with other ports, the efficiency of Auckland Port is quite low. Is it possible to increase profits by leasing it to 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?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

At least 20-30% fund in the proposed need put in Auckland future fund for future development.

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**



#4509



The Port of Auckland is indeed too small and has insufficient loading and unloading capacity.

**5b. What option do you prefer 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’s development restrictions are too limit aa there is no additional land for future development. It’s better to make plans early

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

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



#4509



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

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

Investment for the future, we don't need face-saving projects.

**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?**



#4509



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 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**

Create a leisure and vacation center of Auckland, attract more local tourists

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



**#4509**



1. Develop as first choice for vacation location for Aucklanders.
2. Better medical centers and safe environment to attract retirees.
3. Create as a must-visit check-in place in Auckland.

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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:**

agree on stopping some works regarding cycle lanes and no cars in cbd, need cbd to be safer to be in and having to use public transport there is not very safe.

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

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

central city transport and works, central city isn't a nice place to go at the moment, and there's no parking and little safe transport if going to enjoy the night life there.

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

appears to be not utilized enough to warrant the cost to maintain.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

seems logical

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



**#4528**



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



#4528



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



#4528



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4528



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**

**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 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?

increased parking capacity at northern expressway bus stations

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



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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

we need to prioritise initiatives that result in increased adoption of public transport, walking and 2-wheel transport.

Trying to solve congestion problems by spending more money on roads has proven to be a futile venture.

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

car parking close to bus stops

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

trying to get traffic moving quicker in central auckland

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

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

the stadium's a white elephant. it's hardly used and hardly useful.

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

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

### Tell us why:

selling assets is not a sustainable way of supporting long term plans.



**#4533**



The whole way this proposal has been framed is manipulative. 'Do you want more for less?, just sell stuff and then you can afford it, and there's no downside'. Yeah, right.

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

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

The whole way this proposal has been framed is manipulative. 'Do you want more for less?, just sell stuff and then you can afford it, and there's no downside'. Yeah, right.q1

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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?**



#4533



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

I don't see this as essential spending

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

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



#4533



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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
--	----------------



#4533



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.	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'm fine with it

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

The whole way this proposal has been framed is manipulative. 'Do you want more for less?', just sell stuff and then you can afford it, and there's no downside'. Yeah, right.



#4566

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

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



**#4566**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It aligns with what most Aucklanders want.

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**

Its not hugely required in the scheme of things currently.

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Its not a good idea to sell our assets.

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

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



**Tell us here:**

It would only be a very short term win to lease the operating model. Inevitably shipping costs would be raised by the new leaseholders quickly to get a return on investment & ultimately the end users which are us and everyday Aucklanders will end up paying more for all our goods.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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:**

Its important as part of Auckland's need for cargo space for vehicles & machinery to assist in its growth.

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



#4566



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



#4566



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

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



#4566



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?**

Mostly okay

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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

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

Ensure that facilities like the Art Gallery and War Memorial Museum and all libraries remain available free of charge to all Auckland residents. In a time of austerity it is hugely important that they remain available for everyone to use from the poor to the well off.



**#4587**



STOP replacing sand on Orewa Beach after every storm or high tide at great cost. I lived in Orewa before all the rocks were removed (for so called health and safety reasons) and although from time to time sand needed to be backfilled between the grassed areas and the rocks cost and maintenance was minimal. A similar problem or erosion was experienced in Westward Ho in the UK. They made a sea erosion barrier by putting in a huge number of large local stones starting from a good height angled down to the sea highwater mark level. As I understand it they have had no problems since. Water finds its way in and out the stones which are large enough and strong enough to withstand the tides. Orewa has lost bridges, walkways and foreshore all to placate people wanting to return to sand dunes by the surf lifesaving club. Replaced sand does not stay. Will it take a child to be buried/killed beneath loose sand they are digging into to make Council aware? REPLACE THE LARGE VOLCANIC ROCKS , BUILD SOLID STEPS DOWN TO THE BEACH AND STOP WASTING HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS EACH YEAR ON SAND REPLENISHMENT. Red Beach and Hatfield's Beach are now well sanded and rock pools sanded over as the moved sand is taken by high tides and moved elsewhere. Sheer stupidity.

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

Monitor and trim 'fat cat' salaries and eliminate doubling up of jobs across several departments.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Traffic from the Hibiscus Coast into the city is growing exponentially and will only get bigger with all the housing. It is imperative that Penlink is big (wide) enough to take traffic when it opens and 10 years on. A single lane bridge is ridiculous. It always costs more later and should be at least double laned or 3 lanes for morning and evening adjustments when built.

Cycle lanes should continue to be built connection all the outer suburbs to the city. This is a no brainer.

I am a regular bus user. Park and ride facilities on the North Shore fill up very early in the day. Feeder buses drop off lots of passengers. There should be more feeder buses running all day every day. Overseas I have encountered small 20/30 seat feeder buses running every 10 to 15 minutes in off peak hours connecting people to



**#4587**



the main hubs not expensive to run double decker buses running almost empty less regularly.

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

Cycleways for the future.

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

Empty double decker and large buses being used in off peak hours - see above (I am a regular bus user. Park and ride facilities on the North Shore fill up very early in the day. Feeder buses drop off lots of passengers. There should be more feeder buses running all day every day. Overseas I have encountered small 20/30 seat feeder buses running every 10 to 15 minutes in off peak hours connecting people to the main hubs not expensive to run double decker buses running almost empty less regularly. )

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It is costly as it is but facilities like this are hugely expensive to build and a growing community needs this type of 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)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

As tourism returns to pre-Covid levels the return on the shares to Auckland City ratepayers should increase. I prefer a short wait and see period.

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



**#4587**



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

**Tell us here:**

Infrastructure in Auckland is buckling (especially wastewater in some older areas). This needs to be fixed asap to prevent future cyclonic disasters. Funding is needed now.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

See above. (Infrastructure in Auckland is buckling (especially wastewater in some older areas). This needs to be fixed asap to prevent future cyclonic disasters. Funding is needed now.)

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

**Tell us here:**

No thank you.

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

The continued arrival of cruise ships into Auckland is hugely impactful on our local community. They are only going to increase in numbers. Future proofing their facilities and arrivals while continuing to serve local commuters on ferries is an important consideration alongside all others.



#4587



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Best in the interim although at some stage I think shipping should be moved to Marsden Point and all containers taken by rail not road to their destinations.

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

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



#4587



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

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

No thank you.

## 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



#4587



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**

This is a fast growing and diverse cultural area with lots of new schools and a younger population who need all of the above. There is also a growing poverty stream which needs to be acknowledged and to have available all the facilities they need.

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



**#4587**



Okay

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

No thank you.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

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

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

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



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?**



#4605



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4605



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

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



**#4605**



## 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	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?

Increased parking facilities at park and rides. Stop wasting time with large sprawling car parks and reduce the footprint by building multi-story parking

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



**#4641**



Less of the cultural clap-trap and more investment into useful services - eg keep weekly rubbish collections, scrap food waste bins - just increases vermin flies etc

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

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossing are a time and money waste and serve no purpose other than more aggravation. Puts more wear and tear on vehicles.

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

Dynamic lanes to get traffic moving, more parking facilities at bus and ferry terminals.

### **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:**

A stadium is a huge investment and to get rid of it is just ludicrous. Maintain it at all costs. Change operational management and encourage more diverse usage of the area. Use the vacant car parking area for overflow for the bus parking with a small shuttle to the bus terminus.

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



**#4641**



dont understand.

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

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

No one can be bothered to face traffic to use city facilities so its a waste of money

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#4641



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

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



#4641



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

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	Fairly Important



#4641



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**

Pathways only used sparingly during the week as everyone is at work or school - unnecessary expense and more useless pedestrian lights and crossings will be introduced.

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

Unimpressed - namby pamby claptrap. Nothing constructive in the plans at all.

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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?

Stop increasing rates!

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

Less rates!



**#4659**



**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:**



#4659



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#4659



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



#4659



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



#4659



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?**

Please don't increase 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	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?

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

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



**#4681**



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?**



#4681



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4681



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

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



**#4681**



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

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

Don't worry about increasing rates. We must invest in our future to have a good future. Spending more on rates is an investment in our future.

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



Do not lick any cans down the road. No more cuts.

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Just get on with it - upgrading our transport system (roads and public transport).

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

Yes. Invest more in the future well-being of Auclanders.

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

No.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Keep the shares in Auckland Airport, and in the Port of Auckland.



**#4695**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

35 years is way too long to lose operational control over the port of Auckland.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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



#4695



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4695



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

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



#4695



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**

We must properly prepare for the impacts of climate change.

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

OK

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



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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 Climate change, schools and youth engagement and empowerment, more local board projects that enhance community involvement in their place - love and look after where we live, work and play. The environment needs to be protected and enhanced to keep Auckland a great place to live.



**#4698**



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

Stop the terrible infill housing without proper urban planning and infrastructure. Push back against central government planning rules like other areas in NZ. Out Unitary plan was great and well thought out for our city - go back to it!! No more roads. FOCUS instead on public transport and active transport

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

Public transport and active transport - get people out of cars!!

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

more roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is a great resource that is under utilised. Bring more events, concerts, sports to the stadium. Redevelop some of the area to make it more of a destination.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#4698**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

Climate change is REAL and weather events, food scarcity, loss of biodiversity, clean water etc is only going to get worse - we need to through money at mitigation and adaptation and response. But don't forget the education and community engagement to stop eco/climate anxiety and apathy. We need to engage and empower Aucklanders to take action for the environment and be prepared for what lies ahead. Resilience is key. Starting at Early Childhood Ed Centres, schools, churches, businesses, households, communiities.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#4698



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4698



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?**



#4698



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**

We need to make Hibiscus and Bays a wonderful place to live, learn, work and play. We need to enhance our natural environment and make our young people feel hopeful and excited about their future. A sense of a connected community is key. We want people educated about the issues, given the skills and tools to then take action to improve our area.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#4698**



Ok, but where are children and youth mentioned in the 10 yr budget?

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#4714

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Provide better special education for children with special needs or intellectual disabilities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4714**



**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?**

Construction of the subway

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4714



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#4714



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#4714**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

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?

Public transport and active modes

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Roads for private motor cars



**#4739**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Do not agree with stopping cycleways

Do not agree with dynamic lanes (if they are like whangaparoa then it is impossible to cross the road) unless they are bus lane or high occupancy vehicles.

Do support all public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport and active modes

**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:**

Bad location, under used, no interesting 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)?**

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:**

Prime waterfront location. Just don't let a stadium be built there.

**5b. What option do you prefer 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?**



#4739



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4739



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Why take on funding of refuse collection. Let the user pay so those who produce less waste pay 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 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
---	----------------



#4739



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**

**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	Do 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#4751



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4751



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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?**



#4751



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important



#4751



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	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:**

The stadium is essential for the North Shore but it could be smaller and used more by 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)?**

**Tell us 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:**



#4783



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#4783



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4783



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#4783



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	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 more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Extend library hours

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Food waste bins - we have compost



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Keep Gulf Harbour ferry service going

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Gulf Harbour ferry service

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Community knows area 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:**

Once sold will be unable to buy back - its a major asset- keep shares



**#4808**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Once lost, never regained

Council should have final word on development of area, not private profit- driven companies

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Its a good revenue stream

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Keep ownership of port land

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Council can determine changes to operation of port facility



#4808



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Better than keeping cars all over public space

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#4808



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#4808



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.	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

Planning for the future

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Basically approve



**#4808**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Camera congestion charges, camera road tolls, traffic speed cameras as in London where both my sons live.

Council Traffic Road policing enforcement and visibility.



**#4838**



Council Community policing with policing powers in city areas.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

No - strongly disagree with low budget do less approach - rates are too low and we are depriving future generations and leaving them to do what we should be doing now. Infrastructure is far too poor already and will get a lot worse if we leave it.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Pedestrian and cycleways should be invested in. We all have to get out of our cars on every trip.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Pedestrian and cycleways should be included.

**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 looks abandoned and not adding to vibrancy of Albany. Access is so limited and in conflict with rest of Albany.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#4838**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Strongly disagree with Airport Shares being sold. Bad economics. Airport has provided high returns before COVID and is now booming again and will continue. This economics has made a few super rich in countries like Russia and most are locked out of benefits.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Strongly disagree with cashing in such profitable enterprises. Good economics of retaining a key and continuing profitable enterprise. The Port long term will continue to grow and expand.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Savings is good policy on big investments. Leaving big infrastructure especially rapid rail north and south, east and west, rail to airport, tunnel connections across the harbour are holding Auckland back and failing to provide a city for Aucklanders and rest of NZ.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4838



Retain Port and Airports. Do not give up one bit of it. Put earning in the future fund to invest in the city yes - but not to provide cheap rates.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 look awful.

**5b. What option do you prefer 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 should have a stadium in the city such as Wales has and other cities.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4838



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4838



## 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



#4838



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**

Strongly support mana whenua - care about the future.

Strongly support what happens when we get out of our cars and we need nature.

**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?**



#4840

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

User pay only for food scrap bins



**#4840**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle ways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know much about the stadium do can't comment

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

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



#4840



Tell us 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:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#4840



Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Do not support



#4840



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#4840



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**

**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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Bring back mowing of the lawn berms in Auckland. With the high rental homes and tenants without lawnmowers the city now looks extremely untidy. Bring back rubbish bins in public areas, as the rubbish piling up now is a disgrace. This is what we pay rates for.



**#4848**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less infill housing causing gridlock on our already congested roads and sewage overflows in our beaches. The Arts and Cultural events are wonderful but certainly in the "nice to have basket" not a need. Auckland will cope with a reduction in Council paid events temporarily. More important to provide better roading and infrastructure

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

All planned cycleways should be stopped as they are not being utilised by the public. Stop all raised pedestrian crossings, these are costly and create gridlock, they are unpopular and totally unnecessary.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roading. We need good highways to get traffic moving. Support the National Governments initiative to update our roading infrastructure. Auckland roading is an embarrassment with the gridlock experienced throughout. Bring back rubbish bins in public areas. Check out the rubbish bins along the Mount Maunganui boulevard as an example of excellent planning.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

As mentioned, stop all cycleways and raised pedestrian crossings and speed bumps. They create traffic jams, ruin cars and are extremely costly to build.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#4848**



Utilising this asset to benefit more communities, corporate functions etc. would support the running expenses of the stadium. This is an asset for the North Shore and should be kept 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Under good fiscal management this fund would be spent wisely.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

Investment in the Auckland Future Fund will pay dividends to the Council and help provide services in a well prioritised manner. Obviously astute investment by qualified individuals running the fund is paramount.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4848



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Our waterfront in Auckland is ugly and needs upgrading - Wellington waterfront is a prime example of beautifying the waterfront for the public to utilise. These wharves (if transferred), should not be utilised for housing, only wide open public spaces with hospitality for the benefit of the public.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

We need to keep certain wharves to invest in our cruising industry and export/import facilities. This is imperative.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4848



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4848



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important



#4848



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**

Protection of our environment is paramount over all these other issues. Otherwise we will be unable to swim in polluted beaches etc.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I have not read page 117 of the consultation document but wish to put forward a view held by many in the Bays. A top priority should be the removal of the Mairangi Bay Surf Club Building as it is in disrepair, a blot on the landscape and an embarassement to our Community. It needs to be removed and a newer more practical building serving the needs of the Surf Club and the public (improved toilets and changing rooms) should be improvised asap. This is definately a priority and needs to be looked at.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

As previously mentioned, a funding priority to replace the delapidated Mairangi Bay Surf Club is paramount to provide services to the community. These include educational support for school children regarding water safety, surf life saving facilities and a new toilet/changing room block for the general public to utilise whilst at Mairangi Bay Beach.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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, 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:**

Caution. Take great care to ensure that the Fund is managed independently far away from the grasping hands of future Councils who can subvert the original intentions.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#4853



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#4853



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4853



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Not Important



#4853



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?

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 more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There are more people in Auckland, the traffic is getting worse

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Spend more on electric car

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

fuel

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Too much money on 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)?**

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?**



**#4903**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council already made a wrong decision to sold the airport share, don't make another mistake please. Port of Auckland and Airport are very good nation asset,

Council need to keep them

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

From people, for 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:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4903



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#4903



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	----------------



#4903



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 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	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Water is number one.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4905**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Transport is number2. Use long term debt servicing or public private partnerships.

**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:**



#4905



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Long term plan needed to relocate port to manukau harbor.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:**

Need to condense and relocate port operations.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#4905



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#4905



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#4905



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 less
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?

Maybe do more with less. Crossings is just one example on how to do this.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4908**



Red tape when palling for building consents. We do not need a building prescription when regulations are already in place.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This is a great facility that is badly managed. We should hold more events. If we loose this it would be detrimental to the NorthShore 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)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**



#4908



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	



#4908



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4908



## 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 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.	



**#4908**



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	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4919**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, 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:**



#4919



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#4919



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Rodney, Upper Harbour



#4919



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
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?**



#4919



## 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 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



#4919



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.	
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.	



#4919



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?**

## 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.	
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.	



#4919



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**

Not from the Rodney area

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4919



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 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).**



**#4919**



**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	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?

The Northern motorway is poorly planned. A Busway is impractical as most people north of Silverdale are tradesman which cannot catch public transport. Please minimize bottlenecks (Constellation Drive to atleast 3 lanes) investigate using Murray's Bay what for ferry services to make the gulf harbor ferry more viable



**#4922**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop developing the city Centre. The walkways and cycle ways are attracting a mischievous group of people and I do not feel safe to walk there anymore as when there was cars it felt safer with less intimate people hanging around. Also focus developing other business districts such as Albany or Manukau

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The focus on public transport is impossible. The rapid transport services communities that are too wealthy to want to use public transportation. A ferry to the north shore would be a much better option

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Ferry services. It is a reliable mode where there is no traffic. Buses do not work

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle ways, Bus lanes, raised pedestrian crossings and rail tunnels

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Albany is a Hub. Use it as a business district and the flow of traffic will Even out so not all traffic is going south in the morning



**#4922**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The port currently runs at a loss (I work there) if you sell it inflation will go through the roof on import and export. You will ruin the economy for a short term gain

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the port will ruin the rich history of the port and the new company will just increase prices which the people will feel

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

You need to have better roads. Not Busways

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Do please realiser that Auckland is a port, it is a natural port and only exists because of the marine industry. You can't call it the city of sails if you keep selling it to other people



#4922



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

You can take these wharves back as long as you allow the development of Bledisloe. The current wharves barely work as is

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It's an essential part of port operations for multi cargo

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4922



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4922



## 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.	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



#4922



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
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



#4922



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.	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**

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	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?



**#4928**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think the reduction in cycling infrastructure is short sighted. We have already started a comprehensive approach to cycling networks and lanes and now we are stopping before that is finished - finish it so people have the option to cycle

**2a. Is there anything you 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 not used and a waste of spend to maintain - I do like the community facilities around it and know that the pool and sports areas get used. I would like to see the space redeveloped.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I have ticked proceed but I am very sad to sell the airport shares and create a 'pot of gold' as I have seen varying degrees of strategic thinking and competence displayed by some councilors. This proposal could be a game changer if it is not politicized and squandered on bright shiny things. Have the courage to dream big.



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**



#4928



I do not support residential development on the Bledisloe Terminal ever. The wealthy will purchase, and the public get a tiny piece of access to land that belongs to all of us.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4928



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	---------------



#4928



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.	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
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 think they are fit for funding (not expensive and ambitious) but realistic within the limited funding they will have available

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#4934

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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:**

**2a. Is there anything you 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?**



#4934



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#4934



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#4934**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



#4950

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Footpath repairs to Red Beach Road to make it accessible for wheelchair use to get from Red Beach to Orewa estuary end where there is a lovely wide walkway right by the beach. I see upgrades in centre way road but cannot get between red beach and Orewa safely



**#4950**



**1d. Is there anything else 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:**

I cannot use it

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Safe walking footpaths

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I do not want to see it demolished but repurpose it if need be.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#4950**



A fund would be spent on some bright spark idea like whoever suggested the food bins to blow all over the road rather than make home compost or take to a compost collection point

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 will be ongoing income and in 35 years time Auckland will know what it needs 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:**

Either option is ok but there is much money needed now

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Most central and close to Britomart for any entertainment centre set up



#4950



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#4950



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?



#4950



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**

Accessible pathway - fix broken areas on Red Beach Road to Orewa to enable elderly to wheelchair and walk to the lovely outdoor spaces

**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?**



#4959

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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



**#4959**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport currently is poor and most of the current planned initiatives are a money waster.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Reliability of public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Building slow bumps in the middle of 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:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#4959



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#4959



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4959



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	Very Important



#4959



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	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	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think you should invest in cycleways and pedestrian crosses

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transportation and park and ride

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cones

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

I would love to use more the stadium, therefore it should be used for events, concerts etc.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

To reduce the risks on losing money - but also should prioritise funds that are align to best practices of fair competition, sustainability and commitment to reducing climate change impacts

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

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



#4963



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#4963



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#4963



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.	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 more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4965**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport is a real problem for the city and needs to be far more efficient.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport and parking for public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This Stadium is the only one for the future that is existing on the North Shore and the population is growing. More needs to be provided in the North to stop the population from going over the bridge for events. This Stadium is underutilized due to mismanagement and could become an asset if new management is put in 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I don't agree with selling off the city's assets.



**#4965**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

There needs to be a buffer for future unplanned events.

**4d. Do you have 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?**



#4965



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4965



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#4965



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.	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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Keep North Harbour Stadium in a redeveloped smaller capacity. I should become a center for NZ football (soccer) and the new Auckland A-League team. (North Shore has a lot more soccer support than Mt Smart)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#4974



No more redevelopment of sections for multi story apartment building crammed into inappropriate places. Keep the Auckland Unitary plan as is.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I support all Public Transport development, and network optimisation. I do not support raised pedestrian crossings. I do support stopping cycleways. Auckland is not a safe cycling city, too many hills !

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Another Harbour Crossing, with trains, (that work) I agree with the train network and it's maintenance plan. But I think the Central Rail Link should have been done in parallel with another harbour crossing.

### 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:

I agree that the North Harbour Stadium should become smaller. But that it should , base for NZ Soccer. eg It worked in 1999 for the FIFA U17 World Cup, and could be a base for the new Auckland A-League team. North Shore has plenty of soccer supporters, more than Mt Smart area, The current operational management has obviously not worked, especially the over investment in the baseball Tuataras, baseball being to small a minority sport . So the operational management would seem to need improvement. The trend is for stadiums to be covered, which would be good, if it is possible with a smaller stadium and provide a point of difference to Eden Park and Mt Smart.



**#4974**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 agree with the proposal. Something needs to change to provide money for Auckland and Nicola Willis will not provide it.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Something needs to change to pride \$'s for Auckland. The port area has not been the pride and joy of Auckland so far, but Auckland should remain a port city to avoid trucking freight 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:**

The Future Fund is a good idea, but it needs money to succeed.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4974



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Auckland is a port city but the Captain Cook and Marsden Wharf area could probably be used better.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

I have no problem with freight transport by rail but do not support more freight transport by truck, so think it best to keep Bledisloe wharf for that reason.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4974



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	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 have no problem with 'pay as you throw' rubbish collection, and rates funded recycling collection.



#4974



## 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



#4974



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 am a member of a Deep Creek Restoration environmental group and support less contamination of this historic waterway.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I agree with those priorities. Hibiscus and Bays Board is well run.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Seems fair enough. Councils need money and we have to pay as well as we can. But as a Superannuitant I also support the rates rebate scheme.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?



**#4981**



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:**

This is a major part of the north shore. If we lose it we won't ever get a stadium again. I think we are in this situation due to bad management of the stadium. There used to be a lot more events that would have helped pay for the maintenance costs. It's pretty shitty that it has been mismanaged and the result of this is to redevelop 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)?**

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



#4981



Tell us 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



#4981



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#4981



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#4981



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	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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:**



#4984



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#4984



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#4984



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#4984



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?**



#5011

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?**



#5011



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5011



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#5011**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More major events. What a shame we lost Sail GP to Christchurch this year. If we are positioning Auckland as a major go ahead city we need to attract & host major events such as Sail GP & the Americas Cup! The recently proposed downtown stadium would be awesome to see also.



**#5018**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less consultants, less speed bumps and less speed restrictions.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

To really get a grip on transport in Auckland the council needs to reign in AT! Until that happens the council won't be able to coordinate & execute a comprehensive traffic plan for Auckland.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

A second harbour crossing (incorporating mass rapid transport to the North Shore & to the airport).

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Wasteful bus routes. For example the 983 service that goes past our house very rarely has no more than a maximum of 10 passengers. Many have zero passengers. This is a complete waste of money and brings unnecessary noise & pollution to a residential area.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

It would be short sighted to get rid of a major sports stadium when the future of Eden Park is uncertain and development of a new downtown stadium is proposed. It has also been announced today that there will be an Auckland based AFL side, so where will they be based if Mt Smart & Eden park are utilised by the Warriors & Blues respectively?



**#5018**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to raise more funds to help reduce debt & have access to more capital for investing in major growth projects.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 better utilise council assets in a way that will help Auckland grow but reduce the burden on ratepayers.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 mentioned above.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#5018



While I support the liquidation of assets to fund future investment I do not agree with the sale of the downtown car park. The CBD needs an injection of life, but taking more car parks away will do the opposite.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 should bolster our rail links with Northland & Tauranga ports to free up valuable waterside space for 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:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5018



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5018



## 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.	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



#5018



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?**

I think there needs to be more provision for the 100's of km's of unsealed roads to be sealed in Rodney.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Get control of AT, to help reign in significant issues in cost overrun and unnecessary spending.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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 most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Do not agree with the proposed charges for Park & Ride

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**



#5035



**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:**

it is better to keep the need to transport the goods by truck or rail

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#5035



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5035



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#5035



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	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?

More public transport. PR and comms boot camp for AT. More coherent

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5062**



zebra crossings! get them for 1/10 of the cost would be good. and knock of the speed bumps! where does AT find these geniuses? braking and accelerating causes congestion (look it up! scientific studies about this. even speed is the most efficient). it also uses more fuel (carbon footprint & cost. is At considering this?) it also causes wear and tear on cars (carbon foot print & cost!). AND emergency services hate them, especially fire. Last point is sufficient cause but AT are arrogant.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

congestion charges for motorists, if they reduce congestion, is money well spent and well worth it for reduced waiting times lost productivity etc. If they don't work then they are just extortion. and the outcome will be pitchforks. They key is options and choice. No choice + charges + traffic jams will be pitchforks

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Maybe better PR and comms people for AT? when your organization is a byword for waste, incompetence and arrogance, even if all those things are true, then you could still do with some better spin.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

raised pedestrian crossings. any pedestrian crossings (not number of crossings the actual construction costs! Mind boggling! How do you spend that much!?)

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Its a growing area and could do with more events and communal areas



**#5062**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 the airport is an asset worth holding onto. both for the dividend and because the council ought to have an oar in any convo about 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

**Tell us here:**

does council need to run the port? being landlord and shareholder would be more than enough involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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?**



#5062



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 port is a carbuncle on the best waterfront land in the city. convert those wharves for events and 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:**

see above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5062



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#5062



## 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.	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



**#5062**



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	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Free parking at Akoranga and Smales Farm bus stations

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5067**



Less roadworks - we don't need more raised pedestrian crossing, bike lanes, bus lanes, t2/t3 lanes... all the projects around me have taken so long

**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:**

Keep the stadium and improve it by finishing the seating on the other side. It should be used more than it is. Auckland needs a medium side stadium. Test cricket is looking for a new home? Could the local schools use it more for 1st XI/XV? It's great when club rugby have the finals played there - maybe more club games? Great for concerts as no houses close by like Eden Park. Bus way is close for getting 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Would be nice to enjoy the water front without being a working port. Would love a covered stadium there!

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#5067



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5067



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5067



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?**

Don't remove rubbish bins from the beaches and walkways



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Less admin and elected officials



**#5069**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

already wasted money on rapid transit

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

ferries

**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:**

it a waste 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:**

don't trust you

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5069**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

the port needs to be moved out of the center

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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?**



#5069



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5069



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5069



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**

we have really problems that are being ignored

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

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	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?

Upgrade Browns Bay drainage from Oaktree, though to Sherwood park to remove flood plane on Redwing street - it should not flood there!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5076**



Less wasted spending on consultants,

less random pop up traffic light crossings with over the top speed bump.

We all know you just want to have another Camera on the road with these.

If you are going to build more houses on the same size land, you have to upgrade the sewage and stormwater. These new box houses have no land to absorb rain, and is basically all concrete, current systems need to be upgraded accordingly if you are going to squeeze more people into an area.

Less spending on vanity or virtue projects.

You guys can't even keep the grass cut and kept in parks. STOP WASTING MONEY

As it is I get no value from my rates (TAX)

It's literally theft, all that money I pay what do I get?!??

Right now it's an out of date stormwater system that can't handle the new load, a sewages system that can handle the load, so you guys have to send a team in regularly to unblock/clear.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Definitely less raised crossings, there's heaps already. Wouldn't be so bad if they weren't raised.

For those worried about the carbon hoax, putting in raised crossings increases fuel consumption. Cursing at a constant speed issues less fuel than slowing down then accelerating = more exhaust fumes generated. Good one guys.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

How about 4 lane motorways, no bottle necks, no lane closing and reopening (south bound constellation - Tristram Ave)



**#5076**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

New traffic light raised crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Finish the stadium, build the north stand so it mirrors the south stand and a shelter type roof can be implemented between the stands.

Then it will be able to host big events like ABs or larger 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

**Tell us why:**

The airport should be owned by the people of Auckland, not privatised

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

If it's only a lease and Auckland still owns it, and it will help reduce rates = win/win



#5076



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Keep rates down

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Build that Stadium!!!

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Build that 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 increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#5076



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#5076



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Charge a 0.5 - 1% transaction fee on ALL transactions throughout Auckland city.

That will generate your money +some

**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



#5076



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**

We don't need to waste money on your Diversity virtue signalling. Focus on the core running of the city - Stay in your lane.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Less spending on vanity/virtue signalling projects.

Stay in your lane as a council, and stop wasting money.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

introduce a tiny 0.5-1% transaction tax on ALL transactions done in Auckland Region.  
bank transfers, eftpos, etc

this will generate the money you need, may even be enough that we don't need rates (Land Tax) payments anymore!



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Less community events and less community funding



**#5078**



## 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?

I would like to see more spent on sealing gravel roads within the region. Particularly the ones in the area of Te Arai.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Speed/red light and traffic monitoring cameras.

Ridiculous bike lanes

Traffic lights

Pedestrian crossing

Beautifying roading

Transit lanes

## 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 has been neglected ever since the forming of the super city. It has a much better set up than eden park and should become one of Auckland major 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



**#5078**



**Tell us 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:**



#5078



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5078



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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	Fairly Important



#5078



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**

When we are trying to save money in this council, support of any vibrancy, diversity, arts should be scrapped. This is a nice to have. Everything else is required to ensure safety, and freedom for ourselves & our youth

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I am on board with all priorities how ever, I believe on top of the priority to advocate Auckland Transport to retain the Gulf Harbour Ferry route, We should be expanding the ferry services to include the East coast bays. And adding more boats like the electric foil ferries that Meridian has just provided down south. This will help with the traffic reduction on the North Shore. Rather than the council purchasing the boats it should be a joint venture between business and the council.

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**



#5078



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.	Very 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.	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.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

**Tell us why**



**#5078**



Arts and other programs are nice to have. But our council has no money so these need to be cancelled. Many of these initiatives do not help the wider area.

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I agree with the priorities, but what about the traffic issues in the Kumeu area. It is out of control and needs to be addressed immediately.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Omaha

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#5080**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reliable public transport is very important.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways and cycle infrastructure.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Dynamic lanes.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It's not working as intended, would be more attractive as a multi-use facility.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#5080



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#5080



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#5080



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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.

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



#5080



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?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?



**#5100**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5100



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5100



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5100



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#5100



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?**

Transport going to and from the city , walkways , and maintaining public areas like parks and grassy areas .

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?



**#5106**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Not enough evidence to support the financial benefits of a sale of the lease. Long leases provide few (if any) levers to resolve safety, productivity or industrial relations issues. The Port is performing well and improving fast.



#5106



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:**

Important to keep the Port being able to offer effective services for cruise ships and RORO

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#5106



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



**#5106**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	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?

Not in the next few years - stick to providing basic ammenties.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5112**



Reduce beaurocracy and headcount across Council, stop so much red-tape. Don't mow the berms as often - think like Europe and let roadside grasses grow wild. Stop the proliferation of speed humps and raised cross-walks.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Makes sense - traffic management has become a self-serving industry for the country. Far more human's are injured and die from illness than road injuries that these over the top safety measures are presumed to protect the public from.

### **2a. Is there anything you 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:**

Consider redeveloping but don't lose the stadium concept of some kind. If the stadium goes completely, I suspect another one will never be built - In the last 40-50 years, Auckland hasn't been able to agree on many other significant infrastructure projects let-alone stadiums. Don't lose it entirely to pay down current debt.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#5112**



**Tell us why:**

You'd be robbing Peter to pay Paul - for every action there is a reaction.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

I would propose a mix of using the funds for council services and investing in the future fund.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Its time to be bold and take back some of Auckland's best waterfront spaces for public use. I would not support a proliferation of residential apartment space though versus a mix of retail, commercial, green and entertainment.



#5112



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Consider this next step further down the track, after Captain Cook and Marsden Wharves have been repurposed.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5112



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5112



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**

Keep to the basics, we're in a cost of living crisis.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Fixing and future proofing critical infrastructure.



**#5112**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Public Transport, Public Transport, Public Transport. It is ridiculous that it takes 2 hours to cross Auckland on average. I truly believe that if we had public transport that actually worked (i.e. ferries that don't get cancelled, funding for train repairs, and more bus lanes), we'd see less congestion on the road.



**#5122**



Bring back the god \*\*\*\*\* bins. What you're saving on people who empty them will be wasted on hiring people to collect litter. I suppose we could put our overcrowded prisons to good use and make them empty the bins and pick up litter?

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Resealing roads for the sake of spending a budget so that next years budget doesn't decrease.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Those raised walkways don't really achieve anything. Waste of \$

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport, Public Transport, Public Transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised walkways and \$100k speed bumps that do nothing but \*\*\*\*\* people off.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Currently very under-utilized - needs better operational management. Realistically, that stadium is excess when considering Eden Park and Spark Arena (and Mt Smart), so cut your losses.



**#5122**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

As long as this actually leads to economic growth and not egregious mismanagement of tax payer \$, I'm all for it. Depends if our mayor actually believes in climate change though, I don't see us spending a cent on mitigating climate change if he doesn't actually believe in the cause. Just tell him his precious tennis courts are at risk, that'll get his attention ;)

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

May as well get that up front investment while everybody is hurting from cost of living and inflation.

**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:**

50-50. Council services are important and probably just need a bit of a shake up, but we do also require some investment in the AFF.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#5122



Not really.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

do I need to elaborate? We have a rail network currently on its knees because our finance minister has no finance or accounting background and refuses to fall on her sword and admit she's wrong. Why the \*\*\*\*\* would you reduce the amount of ships the ports can accommodate when the alternative is a railway system that is about as old and decrepit as our mayor.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

do I need to elaborate? We have a rail network currently on its knees because our finance minister has no finance or accounting background and refuses to fall on her sword and admit she's wrong. Why the \*\*\*\*\* would you reduce the amount of ships the ports can accommodate when the alternative is a railway system that is about as old and decrepit as our mayor.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#5122



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Other
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#5122



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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,Howick

## 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 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



#5122



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?**

underwhelming but fine.

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Fairly Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Fairly Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Very Important
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.	Very Important



#5122



Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Very Important
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Just invest more in public transport please, transport in this area is awful.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

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:**

Targeting special events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5133



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#5133



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#5133



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Fairly Important



#5133



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?**

Support a firm resolution to maintain and improve existing stormwater flow where open culverts with overgrown vegetation exists causing potential flooding.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Connectivity by sea, maintain expand and improve the ferry service.

Fund the arts.



**#5174**



**1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Support alternative forms of transport to the car

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Ferry services maintained and enhanced, in particular the Gulf Harbour Service to be reinstated with reliable regular service.

**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:**



#5174



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5174



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5174



## 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.	Very Important



#5174



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**

Investment in the environment has long-term benefits

Connectivity by sea - reinstate the Gulf Harbour ferry service - to be reliable and with a full service as part of an international City. Acknowledge the substantial infrastructure investment for the Gulf Harbour ferry and the need to mitigate traffic congestion on the Peninsula. Buses and ferries are not like with like or interchangeable. Both should be retained.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

The Gulf Harbour ferry service reinstated, returned to reliability, and with a full roster of sailing times including weekends and late evenings.

Retain Gulf Harbour public open space and retain the 999yr encumberance and open space status of the Gulf Harbour Golf Course. It offsets the high density development at Gulf Harbour.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Reinstate reliable Gulf Harbour ferry service and travel options including late evenings and weekends. As an international city connectivity by sea should be embraced and improved. Respect and maintain the infrastructure investment in ferry 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?

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?



**#5179**



## 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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We strongly disagree with the selling of North Harbour Stadium in Albany. The North Harbour stadium is the only one on the North Shore. The number of residents north of the bridge has greatly multiplied over the last 40 years. The stadium has been mismanaged in the last few years. The embankment was demolished, supposedly to develop a baseball or softball park, destroying the potential seating area. That is the reason why it has not been used as much as it should.. We lived in East Coast Bays and assisted in the buying and development when the stadium was built. Our teenage grandchildren still play sports there.

So much money has been spent on Mt Smart stadium but none on North Harbour stadium. Mt Eden should be sold instead, we attended an international rugby game there last year, it is not suitable for international sport. Again, there are no stadium facilities north of the bridge. Please do not close this stadium, rather change management and develop.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



**#5179**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Who will buy those shares, will they stay in NZ?

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I do not know enough of the details to be able to comment.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#5179



I don't know

Tell us why:

I do not know enough of the details to be able to comment.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#5179



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	----------------



#5179



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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Communities are very 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	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?

1d. Is there anything else 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5181



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5181



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5181



## 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.	Very Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Fairly Important



#5181



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 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. Stop putting us in debt.

Cancel all rates

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5203**



DO LESS OF EVERYTHING.

Stop spending money!

Stop borrowing money!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop spending money

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

NO

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

SPEND LESS ON EVERYTHING

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

HOW ON EARTH is it costing 33 million dollars just to maintain 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



**#5203**



**Tell us why:**

Stop wasting money

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

It is an important asset for Auckland - keep it under our control

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Use it to pay off our rates debt

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

stop taking on any debt - pay off all debt immediately with highest priority

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Ports are most important asset to this city.



#5203



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

No other use is better than keeping it for port operations.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#5203



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Reduce rates.

Reduce spending.

Reduce borrowing.

Reduce debt.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#5203



## 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.	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

None of those benefit me.



**#5203**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

None of them benefit me, and need to be revised.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Stop spending money

Stop borrowing money

Stop wasting money

Stop collecting rates

Stop debt



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

As above

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5204**



No - I don't want the council to do less of anything

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

i think council should continue with safety measures they have been putting in place because I suspect (according to research findings) that not doing this will lead to increases in deaths and pedestrian injuries - it's crazy out there

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

see my answer above

**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 has not been successful in its current form, my opinion is it should be developed for 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#5204**



**Tell us why:**

I don't like the idea of selling off all the airport shares - they are a good source of income and will only rise in value in 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 is not a good idea to move away from holding assets - even if only leasing the land and ports

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I'm not sure - I am not against the Ak Future Fund but then I think it is important to continue to fund council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I don't think we should sell of Port shareholding or sell off the ownership of port land - this is using capital value to pay for immediate expenditure - it is selling our children's and grandchildren's future

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#5204



**Tell us why:**

transferring the wharves to public use makes it possible for there to be a seamless Queen Street to the waterfront - enabling more people, a growing Auckland, to enjoy the beauty of these areas

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

I don't think it needs to be 15 years - it could be 20 years to enable working out how to find answers for the port workings.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5204



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#5204



## 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
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



**#5204**



they mean that there are opportunities for members of these communities to say what they want - so that gives them buy-in. Also these priorities are an opportunity to enhance the environment and protect bio-diversity

**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?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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, cycling and pedestrianisation / the development of shared streets - let us have more choice in how we move around our city

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5205**



Stop changing your minds on projects that are for the future of the city and our citizens. The flip-flopping is infuriating, harmful and wasteful. We elect you / give you permission to make decisions for our (collective) long-term success, not pander to Facebook rants from people who just want business as usual. Within council you have deep expertise in planning, design, transport, placemaking etc - trust them and their recommendations, not the views of a man on the street who cannot accept that the current ways of living and moving in Auckland are not sustainable. Let the experts do what we pay them for - because if you don't they will leave Auckland, and AoNZ. Then we will be left with (at best) a mediocre city that fails to attract businesses, events and residents. Get passionate about our city and how it could be world-leading, forget stadiums, cruise ships and other vanity projects that serve visitors more than those who want to thrive 365 days a year in our city.

**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 and public transport corridor development

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Subsidizing free parking

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

There are better ways to use the land and spend the money than clinging onto to the stadium



**#5205**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to have an eye on the future, and on retaining enough assets so that income is available - don't want to sell all the family silver

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

balances ownership and income generation and long term investment

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Need to fund services differently, not prop them up

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Better make sure the quality of the CCO governance and investment partners is absolutely best in class

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#5205



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to AC, then make sure you use quality planning and design to bring residents into the city - residents of all ages and stages. Designed well, people can live, play and work right on the harbour. It will bring life to our city. Do NOT put a massive stadium on there which will suck up space and come alive just a handful of times a year, nor a hotel or apartments only for the wealthy to occasionally visit - let people truly live in CBD. Let them retire or bring up children there. These are the people that local businesses build relationships with, not the cruise ship passengers who come in, buy a handbag and then leave. We must build a local economy for residents not hope that a tourist can save us

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

For now, until other options reveal themselves, makes sense to retain ownership of the terminal because it is an income generating asset

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Do not support



#5205



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5205



## 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	Very Important



#5205



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?**

Too many road projects, not enough alternatives....

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?**



#5211



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5211



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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?**



#5211



## 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.	Very Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Very Important



#5211



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	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?



**#5232**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't agree with the plans for the the outer transport options to be paying much higher fares. Particularly gulf harbour route where service is still v poor.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Electric ferries

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Contracts with Fullers who are a poor operator.

**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?**



**#5232**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?**



#5232



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5232



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5232



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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5247**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Essential to making the transport system faster, more efficient and less congested.

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**

Stadium does not appear to be used very often but I would rather have it remain as a white elephant than use the land for residential 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Future dividends from shares are worth more than selling them and frittering the money away on things increased rates could pay for.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5247**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 and dividends is better in the long run (if it can be done) than losing control of the port operation which is likely to end up being leased forever.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Important part of revenue for council.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Currently the port is in the best place to service Auckland. We have enough public spaces in Auckland.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5247



**Tell us why:**

See above.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5247



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Very Important
--	----------------



#5247



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**

Important for communities to become more resilient and be engaged in improving their local areas.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Transport, recycling and developing climate change resilience are all important but unrestrained growth in Hibiscus and Bays will make it harder to achieve - there needs to be a limit to adding more houses and ever more people to the 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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Funding local events

Upkeeping local walks, hikes, and nature reserves



**#5255**



**1d. Is there anything else 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 more ways to travel, not less. Auckland is already a car focus city, and it makes this place feel disconnected. We need more cycle lanes, bus lanes, and sidewalks, not less

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Busses, trams, bike lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

We don't need any more speed bumps at traffic lights

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Sure you could change management, spending millions on upkeep and development. But why?

- The stadium doesn't have the capacity to host big sport events in either seating or parking space.

- This city already has various other venues to host events, why not put money into those to make them better? Especially if that's where the big events are going to be hosted regardless of what decision is made regarding the stadium.

- The stadium's land could be developed into an area where people want to spend time in regardless of big events, so it gets far more use (parks, playgrounds, outdoor



**#5255**



stores/food trucks, markets for food or people selling nicknacks, art/other events, sculptures, carnivals, etc).

At the moment, Albany has a mall, a swimming pool, and a bus station. Let's develop this place so we have variety.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It's already abysmal that the airport is basically privately owned, why should we support this further by selling off shares which allow council to make a difference?

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

A big payout via lease is not worth it. That money is just going to get flushed down the drain. Does anyone have a plan for that potential \$2.1 Billion? Or is it just going to be a pile of money, that no one knows what to do with, that ultimately gets squandered because 'if you have the money you have to find a way of spending it'? At least make a financial plan first if this is the chosen option, decide what the money will go towards, where the investments will be made.

Retaining ownership will ultimately bring more money in the long term.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



**#5255**



Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Cutting council services, the things that support people in numerous ways, is a terrible idea.

Why 'fund the future' if it involves making cuts now that will negatively impact the people?

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Demolish that \*\*\*\*\* stadium

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Auckland = a whole port dedicated to trade and cruise ship disembarking. A place you walk past, to get to the next car-infested part of the city.

Wellington= port of Auckland on a smaller scale + public spaces. One of the primary locations to visit and spend time at when you live /visit there.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

If we can support shipment requirements via rail both financially and infrastructurally then why not? What option causes less damage to the environment?



#5255



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5255



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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



#5255



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**

These are all important things that have been long neglected. It's time we actually focus on these aspects to improve our local area and I am glad they're finally getting focused on.

Also, demolish the \*\*\*\*\* stadium.

**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?**

Demolish that 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?

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	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The Stadium was built as a long term asset for North Harbour but it appears that the management has not made full use of the facility.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

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:**



#5300



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#5300



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#5300



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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.	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



**#5300**



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.	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?

Do less (reduce 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 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:**



#5313



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#5313



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5313



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	Very 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.	Very Important



#5313



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**

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 less (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	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?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I do not support getting rid of a fuel tax because otherwise taxpayers that do not use the road may have to pay for more of the road maintenance and it would also encourage people to go back to fuel cars rather than electric

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**



#5360



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Because if we get rid of all the ports imports would take a long time to arrive and also we would lose a lot of income from the port

**5b. What option do you prefer 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



#5360



Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#5360



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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



#5360



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?

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 more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Parking at Park & Ride Centres

Affordable parking in the city Centre

REQUIRING AT to better prioritise their spending - taking into account the VIEWS AND NEEDS of the wider Auckland community and families and older people - and not imposing their unrealistic views of promoting public transport to the exclusion of all else.

Ensure all expenditure is based on 'solving a big problem' - not on 'ideas for projects'

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Do not allow AT to impose their ideological views on creating barriers to use of private vehicles. This is NOT their call. Auckland is too geographically dispersed to focus on public transport and removing cars from the city centre.

Do not allow AT to spend ANY money on crazy projects like the Pedestrian crossings fiasco.

**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:**

Councils are not effective in commercial operations.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#5450



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Way too expensive to move Port operations to another location - this will create cost blowouts that will leave the city in even bigger debt over time

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#5450



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#5450



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**

**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	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?



**#5468**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Rather than growing revenue from public transport we should recognize public transport for the good that it is to all of us - reducing congestion and the need for more roads; helping us meet our emissions goal; improving air quality and public safety

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Back to 1/2 price fares for everyone, free fares for students. Scaling up to 100% electric fleet, with no fares for everyone by 2030.

Reallocate road lanes to cycle/scooter use. Expand footpath widths to create space between vehicle fumes and cyclists/pedestrians, espec along school routes

Continue to provide safe separated cycle and bike paths alongside new or improvements to busways and main routes.

Connect cycleways - eg. Northern busway cycleway and NW cycleway meet at Constellation station but it's very inconvenient to get from one to the other.

Continue Northern cycleway to Akoranga Station.

### 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 does not appear to be currently serving the community. I'd love to attend concerts and community events there but these are not currently happening. It seems that something needs to change for the stadium to be (1) considered for events that are currently going to other venues, (2) fit for use - whatever that use may turn out to be.

If the main stadium is not needed as a sports venue, let's repurpose it to fill a community need.



**#5468**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 not clear to me that the airport represents a strategic asset for council, whereas the capital investment provided by the AFF is critical to providing a livable city and a habitable planet

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 sounds like the injection of the lease funds outweighs the returns we get from operating the port. As long as we are not signing away long-term control of this critical infrastructure into private hands I support of this option.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I support higher taxes to deliver more transport spending. And the AFF to prepare for capital investment and protect against even higher future rates increases.

Both rates and PoA dividends are council revenue. Some of it should be invested in current operations and some put aside for AFF. I'm not sure it matters which is which.



#5468



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Right now we need to reduce emissions and build a more healthy, connected and climate resilient Auckland. I don't think this proposal supports the need at this time. Unless it can deliver more revenue than the current operation, due to current financial pressures in the short term we should spend all available funds on strategic climate initiatives. We can always revisit this one in the next cycle.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The benefits are unknown, but the impact has been noted. Extra congestion and emissions are bad outcomes. In short it's not worth it. But could be revisited once we have our climate strategies under control. (ha ha).

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#5468



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#5468



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Very Important



#5468



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**

Climate change will be the biggest challenge of the coming decade. We need to invest in safe active modes of transport - these will become the new norm. However climate change is here so supporting community cohesion so we can support each other in emergencies as well as in every day activities will be critical.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Look good. I am pleased to see both the new penlink and East Coast Rd/Glenvar upgrades will widen paths and create safe cycleways. I hope these projects stay on track.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increasing public transport options.

Developing the north shore as a separate hub to the city (crossing the bridge just isn't an option really) or maybe developing a more accessible hub out west.



#5470



That or maybe some serious investment in a mass transport system linking the shore and the city, like an underground train or mrt system. You could make just the shore pay for it like the proposed light rail plan in South auckland

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Wastage... and I'd like to see more proposals put forward to fix problems long term rather than just fixing problems as they arise

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I like the idea of more public transport, but less cycleways and pedestrian access makes an already car centric city more dangerous for pedestrians.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

A better public transport system linking the shore, and maybe a mass transport system linking the shore to the city

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less on making the shore accessible by car only

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I enjoy using the public fields, I think they should remain in public hands. And I like the idea of having a public held stadium for less invested events like school games etc... but it's just not used and I'd like to see more events held



**#5470**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Don't really know what this means or why you would make either decision

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 like the idea of generating more income

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 an investment in our future is a good idea

**4d. Do you have 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



#5470



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#5470



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#5470



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**

**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	As 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 investment in Hibiscus coast. The Rodney regional plan featured no real changes for our local area even though you are proposing a significant increase in my rates. I don't see where the money is going in my community? Our public transport is very limited from Hibiscus Coast area- we need investment here- A dedicated bus lane, build light rail, more Lanes on SH1 and lighting on SH1 from Albany to Orewa, etc. It is



**#5478**



so dangerous to travel at night on these dark motoway roads. No protection for Orewa beach, which the community has asked for- we need to protect Orewa beach itself from the erosion of the banks. Would love to see a proper walkway around Orewa beach, similar to what Napier has where the sea can be appreciated throughout the year. Better public toilets at local playparks- Orewa beach, Shakespeare Regional park, etc.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

See allot of money investment in fancy bike Lanes that never gets used. This is costly to maintain and should only be put in areas where people want it. We seem to only invest in the public transportation in Auckland City and the South of Auckland- why? Plan in advance, so roads only get dug up once, not multiple times, that affect costs and disruption to traffic.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

- I am happy with investment in making public transport faster. Please look at this from Albany to Orewa, as there is no dedicated bus lane in these areas which slows down public transport.

I agree with less investment in cycleways

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

- A dedicated Bus lane from Albany to Orewa
- Light rail from Orewa or Silverdale into the City
- increasing the number of Lanes on SH1 from Albany to Orewa- need more than 2

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less cycleways. Most don't get used. Need to build better roads, less obsolete cycleways.



**#5478**



**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I do think this stadium has a place in the Albany community. It has lovely public pool. The conference facilities are nice. Perhaps could look at a bit more versatility of the stadium. I would hate the land gets sold off and housing gets put on it, as we've lost so much green space already with the housing in this 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I think we need to hold onto our share of Auckland Airport. This is an asset that belongs to us all. I am concerned if we sell our shares we lose this asset. Also concerned around the management of the fund.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Council holds ownership of the ports but moves all containers up North to Northland, so this area can be redeveloped for other uses that would be a benefit to the public and useful. Currently it is an eyesore and not a nice place to visit. Would love more of a waterfront like Wellington that can be accessed easily, vibrant and a place we want to visit

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



**#5478**



Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We pay high rates, so we want to see that we are getting a return for the rates we pay. I don't want to money sitting in a fund, when we need to be using the money to improve roads, invest in facilities that we can all use, improve the facilities in our local communities such as playparks for the kids, public toilets, parks that benefit the community. Public transport is great but it is not reliable, it is expensive and there are not enough options. We need different modes of public transport to get to work not just one or two options that are unreliable. Need to ensure the public transport facilities are built, there is enough of them and they are cost effective. Not enough parking at the bus stops, so people use their own vehicles instead. We need light rail and properly lit up motorways that are safe to use.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 would love a thriving waterfront where you can bring your family and enjoy the city. Would like more of a Wellington waterfront. Currently the area is not appealing at all and an eyesore for 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



#5478



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5478



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## 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 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.	Very Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response	Very Important



#5478



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.	Very Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Fairly Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Fairly Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Feel like the Hibiscus Coast community have been missed off this completely. Lots of focus on other areas but don't seem to see any improvements to Hubiscus Coast.We are a huge community that deserves investment.Feel Hibiscus Coast has been isolated from the budget.Very disappointed with your plan

**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)



**#5478**



#### **8. Do you have any other comments?**

More investment in Hibiscus coast. The Rodney regional plan featured no real changes for our local area even though you are proposing a significant increase in my rates. I don't see where the money is going in my community? Our public transport is very limited from Hibiscus Coast area- we need investment here- A dedicated bus lane, build light rail, more Lanes on SH1 and lighting on SH1 from Albany to Orewa, etc. It is so dangerous to travel at night on these dark motorway roads. No protection for Orewa beach, which the community has asked for- we need to protect Orewa beach itself from the erosion of the banks. Would love to see a proper walkway around Orewa beach, similar to what Napier has where the sea can be appreciated throughout the year. Better public toilets at local playparks- Orewa beach, Shakespeare Regional park, etc. Some of these have been out of order for months.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

1d. Is there anything else 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?**



#5487



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#5487



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5487



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	Not Important



#5487



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?**



#5488

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 grants to South / Central Auckland which Nort Shore is expected to pay for



**#5488**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public Transport consists of 2 buses an hour which follow each other up or down the road.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Buses around Auckland that do not only go to Old Post Office

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Auckland Transport who have fingers in too many pies, some of which contradict each other ie car parking and use of public transport

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Central Auckland will have to get used to crossing the bridge. Which is cheaper redeveloping North Harbour Stadium or keep subsidising Eden Park. Also North Shore could hold music concerts because of its noise covenants imposed on surrounding areas, Why can't new football club be told to use it

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#5488**



"Community outreach" means more money for Maori. As North Harbour stadium shows it does not mean money for All Auckland, only the Old Auckland City area and minority interests.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Either lease land with the intention of building or improving new facilities to allow closure of wharf front for other priorities OR let Ports of Auckland run as a "For Profit" business and keep out of interfering with 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:**

Auckland Future Fund will change priorities with change of government and will not be spent on current projected plans

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Political interference by government is already ruining POA. There is no where else for the ships to go unless Tauranga is expanded



#5488



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

We do not need another sports field, North Harbour Stadium is already underused

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5488



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I live alone, changes to throw and pay will cost me more and encourages waste. Targeted rates include "Council Collection Costs" and also as fuel levy showed do not get spent on what they are intended for

**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



#5488



**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.	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**

Key is section 3 more power to an unelected minority, who already have to much power. Also pathways and cycle ways built on false information - example North West Motorway's cycleway and walkway I have never seen anybody on it durin weekdays



**#5488**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Won't happen as they are subservient to policies for Central Auckland

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

1d. Is there anything else 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?**

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



#5490



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5490



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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?**



**#5490**



## 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 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?



**#5491**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways should be a priority in your transport proposal to remove cars off the road

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways should be a priority in your transport proposal to remove cars off the road

**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:**

This a good asset that will bring dividends over 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



#5491



Tell us 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



#5491



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#5491



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#5491



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?

Do less (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	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:**

Concentrate on improving public transport, more busses. Stop putting in speed bumps and too many new traffic lights! We don't need dynamic lanes. We don't need new public transport passes, we have the Hop cards.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed bumps, new traffic lights. Paving streets that don't need paving.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Albany stadium isn't utilized enough. You could put more events on, concerts etc. That should generate some income I hope.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 don't think we need a future fund. We need enough to pay for the day to day running costs of Auckland council and council-owned institutions like the libraries, swimming pools, venues and parks. If the council has to sell airport shares then do that and concentrate on the important things to make Auckland a great city to live in (libraries, pools, well-maintained parks, looked-after venues, tidy streets etc.



**#5495**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:**

The council needs to do its job: keep libraries and pools running, tidy up streets and parks, put enough buses and trains on for public transport, have people answering phones for noise control and other issues etc. That is your job.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 seems like Auckland council has already enough on its plate (improve public transport etc.). So why would you purchase more land? There is no need in my view. Don't build more apartment blocks on the wharfs, please! The CBD is crowded enough as it is.



#5495



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It has been working well as a Port of Auckland area. Why spend heaps of money for a few squaremeter and make things complicated? We need the port working 100% as we are living on an Island.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know



#5495



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?



#5495



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.	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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5515**



Yes, look at stopping or pruning any services / projects that are "aspirational" as we just can't afford these right now. For example, Auckland's zero waste goal. The domestic food waste collection is an expensive luxury that has minimal measurable benefit for waste reduction & extending landfill life.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

We don't currently have the funds to invest on inspirational projects such as cycleways and widespread raised pedestrian crossings. Auckland is never going to be another Amsterdam or Christchurch, so new cycleways much show a huge demand before progressing. Likewise raised pedestrian crossing should be limited to outside schools, rest homes and other places where pedestrians are at real risk.

### **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, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Clearly the stadium has issues that call I to question is long term financial and structural viability. All options should be on the table other than "do nothing."

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#5515**



**Tell us why:**

The AIAL shares have failed to deliver substantial returns, so the Future Fund looks like a better option.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Future Fund has a better chance of delivering a decent return on investment

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Future Fund has the potential to provide more sustainable, and substantial, returns

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

As leases on golf courses come up for renewal sell the land for housing while retaining the best of the green spaces with high ecological and amenity value. The inner city golf courses benefit few & are on prime land for building high value housing.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#5515



**Tell us why:**

We need to maximise the return from PoA, and there are better options for the use of the waterfront such as the proposal to build a world-class cultural museum on Wynyard Point that would become Auckland's 'Sydney Opera House,' attracting far more international visitors than some minor attraction on the Captain Cook & Marsden wharves.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

As above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5515



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#5515**



8. Do you have any other comments?

No



#5534

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As 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?

Funding based on ethnicity has to stop. This is council level. Regardless, we should all be treated equally and created segregation.



**#5534**



**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?**

Wasting money on things like speed changes when not necessary. Nutshell...Look really hard at the value you think you are offering in changes you make. Get out of your corporate offices and ask the people

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Valuable space but need fresh thinking of what it can offer. Obviously not well run in the past.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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, you can't keep leaning on ratepayers. Look at what you have already in terms of funding sources. ie ports, shares etc.



**#5534**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No set need for Council go have this. Unless strong desire for a money generating thing that won't fail..keep where earns you money

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#5534



Can't see it providing any benefit.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5534



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
---	------------------



#5534



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**

Nothing specific here or new. Same blah blah corporate lingo. Be good to actually see change not just the rhetoric.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I can't see what a difference advocating for central govt to provide advice on what to do re properties at risk of climate change, eg in flood zones. Council are already championing ot buying In flood zones...so isn't that more damaging and unhelpful to property owners?

Isn't orewa beach already pretty awesome? Aren't there other things that require more focus?



**#5534**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Let's actually see change.

Less talking, more doing.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do more on inspection of health water to let all the business and residents accountable to the environment

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5537**



Do not waste money and please make sure projects are carried out efficiently, more delays means more money needed.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Nz has the highest percentage about having a vehicle in the OECD, which means the we are heavily rely on driving instead of taking public transport. Please think a plan to make the majority easier in commuting in the future.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Metro or subway

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Capped weekly transport pass

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Save money for other projects

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#5537**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:**



#5537



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5537



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#5539

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

less cultural activities and concentrate on basic services, like providing potable water, removing rubbish, waste water services



**#5539**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

the transport systems we currently have dont work well (trains cant run in hot conditions, unreliability of services high cost of services.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Make the par and ride car parks multistory, which is what was asked for before they were built. For example , a 6 level car park building in Albany etc

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

painted cycle areas on the roads, they narrow the road and slow down traffic as less road space for cars (going from two traffic lanes to one to accommodate bikes is not practicable)

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct,Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Since it appears to be the only large stadium on the North Shore, can we look at making it more profitable? I am not sure what it is currently used for.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**Tell us why:**

At least Auckland Airport is likely to make a profit since people will always be requiring the air service.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

a 35 year lease it too long. Better to keep control of the port

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Fund only necessary and essential council services with port profits (water, wastewater, lighting, rubbish removal)

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Port of Auckland needs to keep it operating capacity or else ships will go elsewhere (Tauranga etc)



#5539



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5539



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Auckland Council has an opportunity to lead by example by just providing all the basic necessary functions and thereby reduce their running cost and make Auckland an affordable and desirable place to live

**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



#5539



**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.	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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

There was no consultation with stakeholders prior to the redevelopment of Sherwood reserve. we now have a footpath that floods when it rains and created a mosquito breeding area. Wonderful for 'nature' just not the great for people livining in the area



**#5539**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

remove spending on event. Reinstate spending on libraries, bring back late night for libraries so that people who work have more opportunity to get to use library resources. go back to 9am opening of library on Saturday so people with small children can get in and out before having to compete for car parks.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please change to just providing the basic services. It's the best way to reduce costs for things we don't NEED



#5541

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

More funding for libraries. They do a fantastic job in the community but always seem to be short staffed.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5541**



**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 transport options for the Hibiscus Coast. There are no trains and no express busways.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

cycle lanes.

**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 should be using the stadium more. Especially for football (isn't it home to New Zealand football???) It should be home to the new Auckland A league football team. There will be more football supporters on the north shore than south auckland. Getting to mount smart stadium is a nightmare from north 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:**



#5541



**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

I don't know



#5541



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5541



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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.

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



#5541



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	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do 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?

Fewer managers and bureaucrats. Reorganisation.



**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 has been woefully mismanaged by Auckland 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)?**

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:**



#5555



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#5555



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



**#5555**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**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:**



#5556



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:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#5556



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5556



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#5556



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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?



**#5557**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't support the use of cycling connections. Its funding that is going to waste in my mind when so much more needs to be done. People are not using cycle ways and you're spending money on a minority group. I don't believe that if you build it people will use it. There are other obstacles to cycling - such as needing shower facilities when you get to work and it being a limited means of transporting stuff (can't do large amounts of shopping on a bike).

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Focus on the busways, don't put bus stops in the middle of motorway offramps - that's madness. Get the ferries working and fix the roads that we do have. The current state of the roads is appalling.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I would focus less on the city centre - I think people travel all over the place to work and travel to the city centre less now than they did.

**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 services a large area of the community. All of the north shore and the hibiscus coast areas. It is far under utilised - with better management it could have a lot more events there than it does now which could help pay its own way. The busway and the bus station are very close by which supports the stadium. Public transport for events needs to be included in event tickets like it does with other stadiums and event around the city. Using this stadium more will ease pressure on other parts of the city. I do not support option 2 to deconstruct the existing stadium.



**#5557**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Rates can't pay for everything and the floods from Gabrielle have shown us that we need emergency funds from time to time. I think a fund which is sustainable and maintained is a good idea.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I support leasing the operations out - council should be focused on council affairs, rather than port operations and it creates some income for council to be used elsewhere.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The fund needs capital investment to get it up and running. Once it is established it will fund council services itself.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#5557



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I think a dedicated cruise terminal should be built - the one we have now is embarrassing. Shed 10 should be demolished - I understand its historic significance but its an eyesore. We have a lot of cruise ships coming in to our city and we should be showing a positive outlook to tourists rather than 3rd rate facilities.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

I would much rather the port be moved elsewhere. I think its a blight on the Auckland Cityscape. We want to showcase our city and the ugliness of the port does not support a good look. I understand the port is necessary and it needs to be easily accessed by ships as well as land but I'm sure it could be moved elsewhere.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5557



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5557



The food scraps service is wasteful spending - not many people want the service and they have said as such. There's a lot spent on the bins, the trucks and the staff to provide this service. I wish you would introduce a kerbside soft plastics recycling scheme - this would be far better than the food scraps. We have reduced a lot of our waste to landfill by recycling our soft plastics but it becomes a hassle to take it to a specific recycling point.

## 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	Fairly Important



#5557



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**

The GH Ferry is a vital connection from the coast to the city. It is quicker and easier than going by road and reduces the congestion on the roading network. It is important that this service is retained. The protection of the beach and surrounds from climate change is very important - the anticipated seawall which is very needed is proof of this.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Advocating for the ferry needs to be done now - not in 10 years. Same with the Whangaparaoa transport interchange.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

with 1b, suggest to:

1. reduce transport price so that people movement can be increased via public transports.



**#5563**



2. create more musical/performance events in downtown square centre (where buses are marked). This is a place where visitors pass all the time, but currently this is a boring square and wasteful. It should have music/performance every day. On a yearly basis, have a big music/singer/performance event in Auckland (like the one in Wellington recently). Provide funds to create a vibrant city.

3. promote Screen Industry so that Auckland is a place for film producers to come. With a vibrant city created by point 2 above, many mini videos via personal Facebook, Instagram, WeChat (global Chinese audience), Titoki etc would be created. And the nice culture of Auckland would be introduced to the world.

4. spend more on police in city if needed to keep law and order. create laws for homeless people what they can do and cannot do.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

reduce local board members because local board function is more like a coordinator between the council and the local public. all the decisions and prioritization can be done in the council. hence no need to have a board.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

do not support capped weekly passes because this only benefits a small group of existing heavy users. It does not promote people's habit of attending more events in the city. currently the ticket price is too expensive for people to think about going out by bus. Half of the price is more reasonable and acceptable from the consumer's mind.

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**

A central managed fund is needed for long term fund of the council. but the risk is it can be made into a too complicated one which requires more cost to manage and time delay in using the fund.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

agree the lease option as long as the cash upfront can generate higher return than the dividend option in long term

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

split between the two options



#5563



4d. Do you have 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:

agree to proceed with the proposal to transfer the wharves, but only if these places are created for the public good, like increase international frame of Auckland, rather than create waterfront residential or commercial developments.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

cost of move Bledisloe terminal too high. Instead we can make this terminal an interesting tourism place too, like artistic packaging this place so it wont look so industrial.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#5563



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5563



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Very Important



#5563



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	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	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?

Put the bins back . It’s crazy that rubbish bins have been removed and there are now piles of rubbish in summer months. We NEED our rubbish bins. We need MORE drains cleared, more culverts cleared, to stop flooding . Build less intensively as it stops soak away areas and stop giving consent to ugly housing .



**#5574**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop fixing roads that don't need fixing ( such as in east coast bays) and put more into places that have big issues with slips like Titirangi and the Waitakeres. I've lived in both places and seen the inconsistencies. Give rates rebate to elderly and low income families . Stop wasting money on plastic bins no one uses for compost. And stop finding any rainbow trans rubbish

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to also find free parking for park and ride. Need more decent roads . Sick of Auckland traffic . Reduce cycle ways. Not practical all year around and with kids.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Free parking and parking facilities near park and ride. So hard

Tk get a park near Albany park and ride so I don't both using it . All car parks gone by 7 am

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed cameras. Anything rainbow.

**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's important to utilise this stadium more. It's not being used to it's full potential. It should be operated differently to benefit the community and to bring more sports and music events to the area. Crazy to get rid of it and see more housing there. We need our stadium.



**#5574**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#5574



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5574



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	---------------



#5574



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?

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 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?

Stop spending money on the CBD, Covid changed where people spend most of their time, and investment should happen outside of the cbd



**#5589**



**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:**

We have now lived on the shore for 10 years, and the number of events at the stadium over that time has dropped to nearly 0. It is poor management that is stopping it from being used.

Imagine if the Auckland FC hosted games at north harbour stadium? Easy access from the northern express, and lots of on street parking nearby.

Even use it for big concerts that Eden park doesn't have the consents to hold??

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5589**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?**



#5589



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5589



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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

**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



#5589



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?**

**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	Fairly Important



#5589



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.	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**

**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 introduce a targeted rate



**#5589**



**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 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?



**#5603**



Scrap the food scrap collection. Remove art and cultural work. Cut council administrative support as it's grossly inefficient and wasteful.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Cycleways clog up roads - remove.

Raised pedestrian crossings are massively expensive to install and cost a fortune to maintain - remove

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Council staff numbers.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Massively under utilized. Unless you feel like you're going to start drawing more events then I believe it's time for the white whale to go. We need to stop wasting rate payers money on things we can't afford.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Continue to use to fund council services so rates can be cut

**4d. Do you have 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



#5603



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5603



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## 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
---	------------------



#5603



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**

**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	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?

Cycle route - but not the "gold-plated" ones (as much as I love them). More basic cycle routes all over the city to encourage people out of their cars.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5606**



Cultural events. Nice to have, but not essential. I would far rather money was spent on infrastructure & the environment.

Get rid of ALL plans for raised pedestrian crossings. This is SUCH a waste of money. We made do without them years ago. All they do now is make moving around so much harder and also a real risk for emergency vehicles.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

As above. Cycleways are good, but we can't afford the lovely separated ones.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving public transport faster. The Northern Busway is brilliant, but the feeder buses are infrequent. Unless you have masses of time, it is quicker to drive to Silverdale and park (IF you can find a park).

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed bumps /raised tables at traffic lights. The raised table immediately before the lights on Oteha Valley Road heading to the motorway is dangerous and totally unnecessary.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

We have not used the stadium once since it was built. It appears to be under-utilised. Just don't build more houses on the land.



**#5606**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Totally agree with the AIAL shares being sold to help establish the Auckland Future Fund. A pity some councillors blocked the sale of all the shares a while back.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 makes financial sense and it would help reduce rates

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Although I am OK with higher rates increases in the short term, I don't want that long-term. I like the idea of the profits and dividends going into the Auckland Future Fund, but it appears it will be tougher for everyone in the short term, with not only rates increases but also cuts to services.

Hopefully the Council will lease the Port of Auckland and transfer the holding of AIAL shares into the Auckland Future Fund and this question will become irrelevant.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#5606



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

It would be good to have more public space 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:**

Long-term, it is probably a good idea to transfer Bledisloe Terminal from Ports of Auckland but we need better rail transport so that the majority of heavy loads can be moved by rail instead of road (presumably from the Port of Tauranga).

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5606



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?**



#5606



## 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.	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



#5606



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**

Environment must have priority. Footpaths and cycleways are excellent for getting people out of cars.

I like the idea of activities that promote vibrancy in the area, but they are NOT essential. Focus on core services - water, transport, environment, waste.

(Waste bin removal has been ridiculous in some areas - e.g. Maygrove Lakeside Reserve, which is used by so many people, especially elderly dog walkers, and the bin on the Orewa estuary walkway near Kath Hopper Drive. This used to be overflowing some days so why on earth remove it)?

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Agree with most. Just cut all the festivals and activities if we can't afford it. I would rather the money is spent on core services.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#5608



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Support



#5608



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5608



## 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	Not Important



#5608



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	

### 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?



**#5648**



Reduce council salaries, number of employees and consultation fees. Also stop wasting of money for example, built a new roundabout and zebra crossing and then demolished, build differently again.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I do not trust council will spend money wisely with any plans. Any new changed plan means just wasting tax hiring more people working for government, wasting money on consultation and planning which is always outdated and never worked. Stop.wasting money and do not action.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No. Stop waste money.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Everything including resealing road. If you see what they ate doing, it is obvious that council plan something in order to get money from taxpayers only.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

### **Tell us why:**

None of the plan is saying how council can reduce the cost of running the stadium. Council should create income from the stadium so it is self sufficient.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#5648**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Council just would spend on their consultation and their own salaries. There is not actual solution how money can be used wisely. Stop creating new organization.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 have a source of money, rather than relying on rates from taxpayers.

**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:**

Do not create auckland future fund. Just keep it simple and make one small organization do the basic essential job.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Get less involved in operations and reduce staff levels and salaries.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#5648



**Tell us why:**

Council cannot afford to do any new plan. Stop wasting money and focus on making financial status healthy by fixing the enourmous amount of debt.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Stop spending money.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5648



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

The plan suggested by council on 6a is all about spending money more. Stop spending money.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#5648



## 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 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.	I don't know

#### Tell us why



**#5648**



The answer options are all wrong. It is not a matter of important or not. It is a matter of how council operates. Which means council has been wasting money.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Stop spending money. You priorities are all wrong as saying council wants more 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Council should fix current roads and demand central government use taxes, including GST, to build major roads, cycleways and bus lanes as well as subsidising public transport. Taxes come from everyone including visitors while rates are only from property owners.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

dynamic lanes but ensure buses have a pulloff as this is the only problem with Whangaparaoa Rd dynamic lane.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We have 4 outdoor stadiums plus several large sports parks with comments about another stadium. Lets start thinking as a city not as 5 small independent cities.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 do not trust future councils to waste the Auckland future fund as previous councils have done.



**#5651**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

British companies make profit for UK not 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:**

see above about wasting 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?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5651



**Tell us why:**

The car shipping is very profitable.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5651



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
--	---------------



#5651



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.	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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do 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 removal of Rubbish Bins is going to increase the dumping of rubbish. Also, bins should be installed next to bus stops as drink and food are not allowed on board so these items are dump at the bus stop.



**#5652**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop building expensive cycleways as they are use by only a small percentage of the population and don't make our lives better. The money saved would be better spent on infrastructure that is vital for better living.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways should be scrapped completely and putting raised pedestrian crossing right on junctions and roundabouts is dangerous and doesn't help traffic flow.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I live on the Whangaparaoa and the Penlink Project has just started, which is good but you are not future proofing this road, as 2lanes are not ideally suited for this area considering the number of vehicles using Whangaparaoa Road daily. It should be 4lanes and the proposed Bus and parking deport should be included as the machinery and manpower is already there which would save millions and time if done now.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways and expensive speed bumps,

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

This stadium should be kept as it is an asset to the community, but managed in a more practical way.



**#5652**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 would be better if this Fund was managed by professionals, as this would take away having councilors in control of this ratepayers asset.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 would give the Auckland Future Fund a steady income so they can reinvest for Auckland's future growth.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

An investment fund to help secure Auckland's future is a great proposal, as our rates should be enough to fund council services, if they spend it wisely and don't waste it on pet projects which have limited appeal to the wider population.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

There would have to be good accountability in the management of this fund to make sure it is used wisely and in the best interests of the people of Auckland.



#5652



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 see any point reducing the port dividends. Also developing those wharfs would takeaway money needed to improve Auckland's infrastructure.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Same reason as above.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5652



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No



#5652



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important



#5652



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**

Most of these proposals are important to the community but should focus on all ethnic groups.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Very easy to put into words, but far harder to put into practice. We will see how this pans out over the next ten years.

**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 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 rate rise



**#5668**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

just want money and not achieve anything

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no rate increase

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

save 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:**

more income

**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:**

no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#5668



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5668



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no rate increase

**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
---	------------------



#5668



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?**

good

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

stop rate increase as the promise



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Effective public transport lines! We need this urgently. Public art and targeted regeneration are also very valuable. Protecting the environment should be our number one priority.



**#5670**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

We don't need more highways or roads; this is a waste and only contributes more to our car dependency and climate crisis.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think the spending cap is a good idea but it should be \$40 instead of \$50. Taking the bus should be incentivized and given the cost of living crisis this small change could alleviate a lot of financial stress for people. I already spend \$50 commuting every week so this cap wouldn't really benefit me at all. I love the idea of being able use an epos card in addition to hop cards though. Would be great if we could also add our hop card to the Stocard app or google wallet

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Rapid bus services, trains and quality bike lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Resurfacing roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The facility is rarely ever used and aging rapidly reflecting poorly on its image. Its such valuable land and I think that it could be redeveloped into something much more useful for the community.



**#5670**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't really understand this.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the operation seems like a good idea, as long as it doesn't affect services too much and there are appropriate conditions to safeguard these 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:**

We need to be resilient for the major environmental challenges to come

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



**#5670**



**Tell us why:**

The port is valuable and would make great public space and facilities. I think it would be a good idea to shift this use if it could make more profit, however its important to keep in mind the environmental and economic costs if this service had to be moved (e.g. building a new facility elsewhere). Its also VERY IMPORTANT that the proposed use of this land is accessible for everybody and not just the upper class (as most of the waterfront currently is). If it is used for housing it should be primarily public housing, any proposed facilities should be public and open, the waterfront is our symbol as a city and belongs to us all regardless of income. It would be really nice to see a connected public park in this area (similar to Queenstown). I think a public pool (similar to the spa/sauna complex in Helsinki Port) would also be really wonderful. Heritage is important and it would be nice to see public art remembering the dock workers and history of this area.

**5b. What option do you prefer 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 is valuable and would make great public space and facilities. I think it would be a good idea to shift this use if it could make more profit, however its important to keep in mind the environmental and economic costs if this service had to be moved (e.g. building a new facility elsewhere). Its also VERY IMPORTANT that the proposed use of this land is accessible for everybody and not just the upper class (as most of the waterfront currently is). If it is used for housing it should be primarily public housing, any proposed facilities should be public and open, the waterfront is our symbol as a city and belongs to us all regardless of income. It would be really nice to see a connected public park in this area (similar to Queenstown). I think a public pool (similar to the spa/sauna complex in Helsinki Port) would also be really wonderful. Heritage is important and it would be nice to see public art remembering the dock workers and history of this area.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#5670



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5670



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5670



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**

It's important to work towards climate resilience

**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	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?



**#5673**



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?**

Funding for unsealed roads can be better used elsewhere. Investment in cycleways should be heavily limited, or no new investment - maintain existing only. Charging for park and ride will do nothing to encourage use of public transport, bad idea.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Under utilized and too expensive to maintain. Could sell and privatize or demolish and develop the grounds into a series of smaller fields for local sports clubs. Combine for cricket/rugby/tennis etc grounds and close grounds of those local teams/schools. Reduce the number of sites needing to be maintained - these sites could be sold for further development or repurposed.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5673**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?**



#5673



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5673



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Support reinstatement of fees for hireage of public/event spaces

### 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
---	------------------



#5673



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Accept that cars and trucks are essential for the city to function.

### 1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Improvement is essential.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Off street parking facilities

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Please don't sell it. Auckland is short of stadiums fit for purpose.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 fund is likely to have a better income return from the investment of the sale of the AIAL shares .

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5693**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Auckland Future Fund will have many expensive infrastructure projects to bankroll in the future. Also unexpected disasters such as floods, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes etc require remediation.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

As above.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 ferry terminals could be transferred there.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5693



**Tell us why:**

In the meantime the Port of Auckland needs space.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5693



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

None

## 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
--	------------------



#5693



Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Very Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Fairly Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	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.	Fairly Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Emergency management for local groups important

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Good

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**



**#5693**



Not from the Rodney area

**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	
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?

Better roads, more motorways to improve the severe traffic congestion. People use cars - families NEED cars. Accept it.

Stop taking away public car parking. The small businesses are hugely suffering as a result and you are ruining the small town communities financially.



**#5696**



**1d. Is there anything else 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?**

Main arterial roads and motorways to improve economic outcomes. The congestion is holding Auckland back financially.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Events. Use the money on infrastructure

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Its a great facility that is totally underused. Have more public outdoor space - make it a place for youngsters to be able to gather. Lots of mini Basketball courts, playgrounds, mini tennis courts, etc. Lots of seating and shade. Make a place where locals on the north shore want to come and gather.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#5696**



Auckland needs infrastructure upgrades badly.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Need much more accountability. This is a lost opportunity for the Council to garner more \$ and have better control. Currently, Auckland Council are the Ports puppet.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Stop intensification! Especially on the north shore as there is no where near enough infrastructure. The 3 x 3 buildings going up are cheap, badly built and are ruining the north shore. The current council staff will be responsible for growth that isn't sustainable. Build new homes where there is NEW infrastructure and new infrastructure can be built properly to allow for growth, NOT in existing suburbs and towns.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#5696



Aucklanders deserve more waterfront, public gathering spaces. Make it green space with lots of seating, shade and playgrounds, etc.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Its obvious - surely!?

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5696



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**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:**



#5714



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#5714



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#5714**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The general condition of our footpaths and walkways (I can only speak of the North Shore) is very poor. General maintenance has degenerated since formation of the super city.



**#5716**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Fancy road crossings and unnecessary speed limit signs which are way over the top

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree with the raised crossings but we do need more cycle ways for added 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?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 shares should not be sold but kept as an asset

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#5716



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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



#5716



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	



#5716



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#5716



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**

**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?

Definitely not.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5747**



Yes please, less Rates. The cost of food has increased heaps - food is a basic necessity of life. Rates are a huge expense and difficult for some people to meet those increases.

**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?**

Definitely not.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Yes, speed humps on roads. Also less on cycle ways. Auckland is a hilly city and as a former cycle user it is a difficult city to bike within.

**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?**



**#5747**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years would mean that the port could not be relocated for that 35 year period. If one looks back 35 years and reflects how fast Auckland city has grown, what will it be like in 35 years time? While the port is council controlled there is more flexibility should it be decided that Auckland city's port operation be relocated elsewhere.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 need is immediate.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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



#5747



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5747



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
---	------------------



#5747



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?**

Definitely need this one:

- advocate to the Governing Body for sufficient funding to be allocated to enable Auckland Transport to deliver the following projects within the currently expected timeframes: the Whangaparāoa Transport Interchange, upgrades and reopening of Vaughans Road and Okura River Road, and the Glen

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?



**#5753**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5753



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#5753



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5753



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	I don't know



#5753



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Orewa Sea defences - ongoing review of requirements.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Pedestrian crossings and not prioritising road repairs.



**#5763**



**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:**

To maximise efficiency of these assets.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#5763



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#5763



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5763



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#5763



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 the basics right first and then deal with the nice to haves.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Generally agree but priorities may need review over time.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Option 2 is not actually an option but several suggestions so gives no firm idea of what will happen at 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)?**

**Tell us 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:**



#5768



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#5768



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5768



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Fairly Important



#5768



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 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?

Get majority of traffic off our roads and make our public transport efficient as in other main cities around the world.. Make Auckland transport accountable in its practice

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



We do not need extra trucks on the roads collecting household waste.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

You should be focusing on a city where it is safe to walk or bike everywhere or catch buses that people do not have long waits between connections.. This includes safety for eg the handicapped, the blind, the elderly. Our bike ways so far are unimpressive. Too near traffic, stop and start often with long gaps

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No traffic bumps. A waste of time. People should learn to drive according to conditions

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Best to have a genuine manager who cares for the community and not one focused on profit for himself

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:



**#5771**



Dont like the idea of Auckland shares being eventually sold off leaving our city yet more impoverished

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 it out to a private company can mean increased costs, environmental damage and no say in its operations

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 has been elected to look after the city and each of its inhabitants fairly

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 it decent vibrant pedestrian area where impromptu concerts/ buskers can entertain. No residential housing or commercial enterprise benefitting only a few



#5771



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

As above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5771



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#5771



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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

The current council has ruined many local nature walks, replacing them with gravel and board walks at a huge expense and with no public consultation. Many of these lovely nature walks are now destroyed.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



Sounds good but think you will not deliver your promises

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I might have missed the question but you have spent an extravagant amount of money upgrading tracks in the Waitakeres and now Trampers have nowhere in Auckland to go. Trampers like nature not city walks with numerous people all crowded together



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?



**#5774**



Typical format that does not allow genuine feedback. Council needs to stick to the basics, roading (for cars, not cycling or public transport), water, waste. Too much money is wasted on non essential initiatives. I am livid that AT is wasting millions on traffic calming and roading destruction designed to increase congestion. Council has too many staff involved in too many unnecessary projects.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Too much is spent on unused cycleways, removing car parking, empty buses and trains. We need less climate ideology and more roading improvements to keep pace with our growing population.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roading and parking for cars, but not the lunacy that AT is currently pursuing.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Public transport, cycleways, 'safety' & climate change initiatives. Stop trying to control how we want to live.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Stupid to tear down this asset. It should be utilised more efficiently with more events using 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)?**



Other

**Tell us why:**

Until Council learns to balance its budget and concentrate on spending for essential projects selling assets will only result in more stupid unnecessary spending.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Ports of Auckland has damaged our economy through waste and incompetence. We need effective management of this asset and reduction of union corruption. It is vital that we have a cost effective and efficient port. The attempted mechanization was inept, however the return to union stranglehold is just as bad.

**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:**

As explained the priority is to bring down Council waste.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I am deeply concerned that changes will result in corrupt Maori control over assets that belong to all of us.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#5774



**Tell us why:**

Our Port needs to have sufficient room to modernize and expand. It cannot be controlled by an idiot left wing Council with no economic intelligence.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Port land assets should be kept for Port use. Restricting the ability of the Port to function into the future is lunacy.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5774



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Learn to accept the need to stop wasting our money. The size of Council and inability to adequately manage expenditure is staggering.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#5774



## 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
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



**#5774**



Too much money is wasted on lunacy, We need roads for cars, clean water and adequate waste. Stop wasting resources on climate & Maori BS..

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Expensive lunacy led by climate change and Treaty fanatics with no common sense.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Council has proved itself to be wasteful and incompetent. I have reached the stage that as a ratepayer I detest the vast majority of Council priorities. You are ruining our City.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	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 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.



**#5807**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Well you've taken the bins away for a start so probably no stopping ya

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Still need to improve the cycling infrastructure to make it more appealing and safe for the ones that want to commute via bikes as it reduces congestion and CO2 that's put into our air

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycle ways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Paying roads to be fixed twice when it should be done correctly the first time

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**Tell us why:**

The airport almost been once and the council saved it, who's going to do it next 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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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



#5807



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5807



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Rodney, 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	Fairly Important



#5807



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	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 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
--	------------------



#5807



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.	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?**

## 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?**



#5807



Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library	Not Important
Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development.	Not Important
Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety.	Not Important
Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses.	Not Important
Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei.	Not Important
Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways.	Fairly Important
Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026.	Not Important
Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community.	Not Important

**Tell us why**



#5807



7c. What do you think of the Ōrākei 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.	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.	Not 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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



**#5807**



**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?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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?

Libraries need to be brought into the 21st century and become cultural hubs.

Also the environmental spend programme Goff setup was flawed, better results for the world could have been generated, along with improving education, employment and revitalising the CBD if Auckland Council used the environmental funding to setup a



**#5863**



research grants system for UoA and AUT to use in conjunction with businesses that would result in new technologies that AC would have a future right to payments for.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Your research into the compost bins was flawed, there are already eco friendly methane capture mechanisms at landfills. Stop wasting our money on compost bins.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I'm prepared for the investment to happen, but have very little confidence that the right people are in place in AT to make it happen. They don't spend what they have wisely and then claim to be under funded.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Future planning - we need a proper city growth vision and build forward for that.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Management

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

There are newspaper articles back to 2000 which show the stadium had financial problems and couldn't fund its own growth.

It's too big and in the wrong place, it was built as a rival to Eden Park and never got further than 1/4 done.



**#5863**



I live on the north shore and frankly that stadium is a joke, should never have happened and has failed despite having multiple management models over time.

Stop wasting money on ideological pipe dreams, develop the land (actually develop all of it) and put the money back into infrastructure the city 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)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Setup the fund and move the airport into it, but shut the port down and sell the land. Freight through the central motorway system is crippling the city, rail will never be ready as the gauge is narrow, you'll get good money for the land - much better than the port will ever deliver.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Shut the port down, sell the land and pocket the 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:**

It's an unreliable revenue stream at best that shouldn't be a corner stone of any budgeting.



#5863



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5863



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Can we just lock in 7.5% increases pa for the next 3 years?

Any surplus needs to go into paying down debt.

Council needs to get on top of the Len/Phil Debt Death trap



#5863



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Not Important



#5863



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 think my local board has lost touch, it's an area that is becoming more popular for working families and needs to reflect that lifestyle. The local board demographic is very out of line with the community and isn't bringing ideas that reflect the community.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Focus on working families, not this community fluff stuff.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

1 - Eden Park's \$50m loan with interest fixed below Council's own cost of borrowing. What are you doing about it?

2 - <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/sport/north-harbour-stadium-under-threat/JDJ7PY3M4C2KBRXEA56SKGDKGE/>



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5865**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5865



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#5865



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5865



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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, Waitākere Ranges

## 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	Fairly Important



#5865



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?**

I support them, and would also like to see continued support from the board to enhance our urban ngahere.

**Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	Very Important
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Very Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	Very Important
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	Fairly Important
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Very Important



**#5865**



Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Fairly Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Fairly Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Very Important
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

1d. Is there anything else 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?**



#5876



Other

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5876



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5876



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	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



#5876



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 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.	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



#5876



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?**

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Very Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Very Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Very Important
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	Very Important



#5876



Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Not Important
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport and good care for the environment are central We need to pay more so that there is a good base for future generations. This should be funded on a more equitable basis with those who are able to pay more doing so - rates increases need to



**#5882**



protect the position of the poorest and if those of us who are more affluent have to pay more then that is the price of living in a decent society.

**1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Good public transport is critical to meet social and environmental goals. The physical environment need to be safe so the steps to manage transport safely for all ,especially walkers and cyclists is critical and so reducing expenditure on the areas is a serious error.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

See above - improving public transport is an obvious area for greater expenditure and for prioritisation.

**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:**

Clearly the stadium is not fit for purpose, but North Shore needs a good public facility, integrated closely with public transport availability and services.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#5882**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The city cannot and should not sell its assets, they are too important to be transferred from public to private ownership (which would happen eventually with inevitably the result being that public good is replaced by private gain).

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 of the importance of public ownership rather than transfer to private hands which are driven by a different private agenda.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#5882



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

There needs to be a clear plan for the development of the port before any definite plans can be made for Bledisloe wharf - it is impossible to give feedback without this plan, but clearly any plan needs to include improved rail options - a plan that simply increased the number of trucks into and from the central city would be disastrous.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5882



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

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:**



#5916



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#5916



Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



**#5916**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

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:**

I oppose the proposal to lease the operation of the port for 35 years for the following reasons:

- Disregards Expert Advice: The proposal ignores expert advice on the port's unsustainable location, as evidenced by the conclusions of the last three port studies.
- Hidden costs: Locking the port into its current location until at least 2060 will impose billions of dollars of road and rail costs on future generations as freight flows increasingly strain our already congested transport network.



#5939



- Long-term Impact: Prolonging the status quo until at least 2060 will prevent Auckland from realising the significant social, economic, and environmental potential we could achieve by transforming the industrial port zone into a thriving urban environment, as we've done with Viaduct Harbour and Wynyard Quarter.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	



#5939



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



**#5939**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

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	Do 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, 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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move the port away from Auckland

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#5942



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	



#5942



<p>for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#5942**



## 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	
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.



**#5954**



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?**



#5954



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#5954



<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 <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#5954**



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	
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?

Multi level car park at Park and Rides.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get rid of Auckland Unlimited



**#5956**



## 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?

Getting mor cars off the roads by providing more car parks at park and rides

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Staff at Auckland Transport

## 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



#5956



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	
--	--



#5956



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



#5956



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Not Important



#5956



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 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?

I would be prepared to pay more for the Gulf Harbour ferry to keep it in service

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5962**



Some roads seem to be resurfaced far too regularly. This seems like a waste of resources. I have lived in Remuera and it seemed like every road around me was resurfaced within the 2 years of me living there. A lot of these roads were in good condition. Similarly I have now moved up to Whangaparaoa and large sections of the main road have been resurfaced, even though the surfaced seemed fine

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I would like to see support for the continuation of the other ferry services included in the proposal, including investment into hydro foiling electric ferries to improve the reliability of the services.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

supporting outer ferry services

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

resurfacing roads as regularly

## **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:**

Resources could be better used than upgrading a stadium. It is clear this region is under financial stress and we need to allocate resources effectively. I would support changing the operational management so that the venue is used more regularly by the community



**#5962**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I believe the equity currently invested in Auckland Airport could be invested more effectively elsewhere and would return a greater ROI if managed correctly. It also helps to diversify the councils portfolio

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 council should be focusing on running these areas more effectively. I does not make sense that someone could be leasing this and maintain the existing services to the community without passing on that lease cost to the community. Therefore you may as well maintain control of operations and gain that revenue from rates or operational efficiencies instead of leasing

**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:**

There needs to be a balance of investment into a future fund and investing into the coucil services. I would suggest profits and dividends could be split 30:70 respectively. This seems an appropriate investment into the future fund while addressing the immediate needs of infrustructure and transport etc.



#5962



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Having the public ferry service operating from the existing areas effectively connect commuters to the city. Moving these services to the Bledisloe terminal would only delay commuters and mean more time away from family/work

**5b. What option do you prefer 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 existing land use seems to be the worst use of land imaginable for our city. It seems incredible wasteful to see thousands of cars parked on what is arguably some of the most valuable real estate in the city. The added congestion of these vehicles through the CBD is also an issue. Moving this port service should be a priority.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#5962



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5962



**6b. Do you have 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 outer ferry services are not only a more effective transport service in terms of time saved, but they also are a calming way to start and end the workday, and connect communities/commuters

**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 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



#5962



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?**

Protecting the Gulf harbour ferry service. This service not only reduceds traffic on the areas roads, but it is also critical for connecting the peninsular with the rest of auckland. There are 2 spots on the peninsular which are currently single road access and if anything happens to these areas we need the ferry.

**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.	Not Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response	Very Important



#5962



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.	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**

We are in a recession, therefore we shouldn't be looking for new projects, but resources should still be allocated to existing projects to strengthen the resilience and health of our infrastructure and environment.

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

We must fight to maintain the gulf harbour ferry service. Penlink is not a substitute for ferry travel.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**



**#5962**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better public transport

Restoring nature

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Turning on street lights in new sub-divisions BEFORE any houses are under construction!

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I'm disappointed by the level of planned expenditure on factors that increase use of public transport and reduce the threat of climate change.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I would like to see more done on decarbonisation of the bus fleet.

I want to see more not less buses and ferries.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

I don't support the resurfacing of roads that are currently unsealed.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

I believe having a stadium on the shore is vital for the community but that it needs to be redeveloped to make it fit for the future.

It also needs local operational leadership

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 want to see the communities stake in AIAL sold off. The income source should be protected for future generations. If we sell the airport, we only do it once! This may help finances in the short term but not for future generations.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**



#6008



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#6008



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#6008



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.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

I'm a little underwhelmed by lack of specificity and ambition in the priorities both next year and over the next 10 years - especially compared to those of the Kaipatiki Local Board. There needs to be much more here about protecting and restoring nature and supporting community groups to help engage residents to do so. I'm also concerned about what the review of 'future uses of undeveloped reserves' might result in?! So long as they are retained, not sold or developed, and there is a major focus on nature restoration, weeding and pest control - together with enhancing the opportunities for people to get outdoors and enjoy the wellbeing benefits.



**#6008**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I strongly support the Glenvar and Vaughan's Road upgrades.

However I'd like to see a great deal more in here about protecting and enhancing nature, for example investing in supporting groups in the Long Bay area to use restoration to connect and mobilise the new and fast growing number of residents in creating thriving green (weed and pest free) corridors from the regional park to east Coast Road and beyond.

I'd also like to see a new community centre for Long Bay as a key priority, as its going to be impossible to build a sense of community without a bookable space for residents and organisations to use to help do so.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Local Board funding is vital to support healthy communities and I do not support the Pay Less/Get Less proposal - that would inevitably result in damaging cuts.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#6013**



**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:**



#6013



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#6013



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6013



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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 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



#6013



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?

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.



**#6026**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6026



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6026



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#6026**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Not so much as do less, but do better and cheaper.. ie. Rubbish collection in Parks - 1 truck to empty the bin and to pick up the extraneous rubbish is a waste of resources.



**#6036**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Do not need more cycleways in Auckland when it is not a city suitable to cycling to work.. Raised pedestrian crossings are more distracting than watching for the pedestrians - you are so busy looking what you are going over your attention is not on the pedestrians...

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Traffic Management - so many signs - distracting even when they are not working on the road you are driving on - and then they are left behind afterwards..

CONES.... someone is making alot of money out of them

## 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:

I dont believe the council need to have a shareholding in the Airport.



**#6036**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 lock in a lease of 35 years is too much given that the city cannot cope with the traffic that is generated by Port movement already.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#6036



**Tell us why:**

Auckland City needs public spaces on the waterfront to maintain itself as a vibrant city, the port operations detract substantially from that, not to mention the traffic associated with the Ports.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#6036



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#6036



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.	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	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?

Rubbish bins, keeping streets and footpaths clean

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No more cycleway funding.



No more public transport funding or capping

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Public transport is useless, no feeder buses that connect regularly to main hubs. Cars parked everywhere and having to drive to connect with trains and buses

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Traffic management making the light signals work correctly to allow traffic to move better..

Roadworks managed better without a thousand cones causing delays unnecessarily

### 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:

More events I don't want to lose 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#6040**



**Tell us why:**

Don't agree with selling 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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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



#6040



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#6040



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#6040



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**

The priorities should be rubbish bins, maintaining parks and roadside trees, palm trees not had dead fronds removed which are a hazard when walking. Public toilets what a disgrace the portaloos are at Orewa. Seawall for Orewa Beach

**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	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Weekly recycling bin collection

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6049**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Traffic congestion in Auckland is making life very difficult

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less on expensive raised crossings and making it difficult to access businesses with cycle lanes that no one seems to use

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The existing facility and grounds needs investment to ensure they are fit for purpose eg carpark seal, access roads - status quo does not seem to be achieving 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Seems to make sense to have a broad diversified fund rather than heavy ownership in specific assets

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council ownership of the port is always going to be too political to be able to make the best decisions on its operations

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

History shows that wharves used for public benefit are wasted assets - location of the cloud is a case in point - empty space with a few people aimlessly strolling

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#6049



Assumes has greater value from being retained as part of the port - decision should be based on best return for Council

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6049



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
--	------------------



#6049



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.	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	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. Would like to see Council do more with the money they have, be more efficient.

Drop red arrows at traffic lights after green light is on, use give way rules to turn when no traffic is coming.



**#6052**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

No more speed humps on pedestrian crossing. Less traffic management - inefficient use of labour and resources when 6 guys sit on their arses all day watching people work. There are more people putting cones on the road than those doing the work.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

LOL as above re raised pedestrian crossings and traffic management

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport if people are using it

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Public transport if people aren't using it. There are a lot of empty buses on the road.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It seems poorly designed and hardly 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#6052**



**Tell us why:**

Having the future fund wont make the council more efficient

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Having the future fund wont make the council more efficient

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 want council services like rubbish bins at parks and someone to empty them.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Use existing money better

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

An efficient Port benefits the public. Spending money needlessly does not.



#6052



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

An efficient Port benefits the public. Spending money needlessly does not.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#6052



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#6052



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**

And put rubbish bins back in the parks

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

ok

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
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 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.



**#6064**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

To date traffic has become worse caused largely by unnecessary anti vehicle programs run by AT

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**



**#6064**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#6064



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	



#6064



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



#6064



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



**#6064**



### **Tell us why**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

### **7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

### **8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6081**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6081



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6081



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#6081**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- 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.
- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

## 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 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?

Buy more beaches for regional parks

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less islands, cycleways, traffic calming, charge higher bus fares - user pays



**#6084**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Bus fares should be increased to cover the cost of running the service

Waiheke ferry should not be subsidised people choose to live there and if they want to commute to Auckland they should pay the full cost rather than being subsidised by the ratepayers. Stop all further bus lanes and cyclways which are choking our city up. A non stop express bus from Silverdale to the city should be provided, the people closer to town have several buses so a few that don't stop until they get over the bridge won't affect them and will provide a much faster service for commuters.

When will council realise that public transportation does not work for the majority of people who travel long distances to work and need their vehicle during the day for work

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A bus lane from Silverdale to Albany

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cyclelanes , traffic calming, raised pedestrian crossings, reduced speed limits

## 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 a great stadium it just needs to be managed better and have more events there including concerts



**#6084**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It will cost more to manage and just keep the shares once they are gone you can't afford to buy them again

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

With Leasing we would lose effective control of the port. The council then retains the profits generated by the port

We don't want the Chinese having control of our port as it is a security risk

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#6084



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

What nobody seems to realise is that we have pretty good views of the harbour with the port as it is. If you build on it the views and sunlight will be lost, sure some architect will come up with a fancy scheme that will lmaybe look ok now but in 10 years time will look \*\*\*\*\* awful This port provides a good income for the city and just because some people want to gentrify it it should not be allowed

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Same as answer above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6084



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?**



#6084



## 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.	Not Important



**#6084**



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	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.



**#6087**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6087



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#6087



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



**#6087**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Fixing roads, managing public spaces better (i.e public bin collection, general maintenance of spaces). Replacing old road signage & paint in pedestrian areas (crossings etc)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6091**



Less public transport, less “niceties” and more realistic spending. Not overly interested in renaming things for the sake of it. Money should be spent on the things Auckland needs first, not what it wants.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I don't feel that currently, public transport needs huge amounts of funding. Our roads need proper maintenance, to therefore have to spend less on them moving forward. We need to ditch raised pedestrian crossings and opt for more cost friendly options that keep both cars and pedestrians safe. It is a good idea to pause more of the “niceties” such as cycle ways until we are in a more stable financial position. They're nice to have, but not something that should take precedent over the maintenance of roads we already have and depend on.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Definitely road maintenance, not just road surfacing but also signage, painting etc. I drive as well as walk often and find that often the lack of signage around is a hazard when walking.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways, busways and public transport in general.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

As someone who lives on the Hibiscus Coast, having a stadium that can host sports, concerts etc within close reach would be awesome and I feel it would bring more money into the local communities.



**#6091**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

After the Auckland Floods I think we need to be future proofing and investing money where it needs to be invested. If shares need to be sold in order to do this, then I'm all for it

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 feel the ports should not necessarily be the councils biggest concern, especially if they can be leased out and managed by someone else. We need to be investing in the future and I feel this is a good way to do so

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

If the council continues to operate the ports, it may as well stay as it is. Council run and the money is returned to council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#6091



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6091



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6091



## 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.	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



#6091



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.	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.	Very 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.	Fairly Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important



#6091



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?

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	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.



**#6092**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

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)?**



**#6092**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#6092



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#6092



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#6092



## 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.	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.	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



**#6092**



“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#6094**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6094



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6094



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#6094**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Roads and infrastructure

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less bureaucracy and senior managers being paid way too much!



**#6097**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Roads and infrastructure are a priority in my eyes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roads

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Senior managers

**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 the only stadium on the North shore covering Rodney also

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6097**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#6097



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6097



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#6097



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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do less
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



**#6099**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

- City and local development
  - Stop urban regeneration projects and put a hold on investigating inclusion of new areas
  - Do not restore Eke Panuku's \$100 million Strategic Development Fund
  - Do not complete the Midtown Regeneration Programme and the Karanga-a-Hape Station oversite development
- Economic and cultural development
  - stop subsidising under performing assets and programs
  - stop providing natural and cultural heritage experiences through our regional facilities
  - Remove the existing free and subsidised entry to programmes and events
  - Stop funding the Lantern, Pasifika and Diwali festivals
- Council Support
  - Reduce Māori outcomes current funding and do not increase. Limit projects of interest to Māori.



- Parks and Community
- limited investment in new land or growth

## 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, 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



#6099



Tell us 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



#6099



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#6099



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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

Not Important



#6099



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.



**#6099**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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?

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.



**#6100**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6100**



**Tell us 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?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have 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



#6100



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	



#6100



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#6100



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.



**#6100**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



**#6102**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop fixing roads and work on public transport.

Stop trying to make the city a 'wonderful place', businesses will develop to meet the people's desires, they dictate what people come to see and do, not a concrete park with trees in it.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Improving buses, more of them and funded from a fuel tax, public transport yes. Just stop on roads, leave the raised crossings, just stop spending money on roads. Main arterial routes fix potholes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

bus shelters and connecting buses.

More parking wardens issuing more tickets for parking on yellow lines and less for over staying paid parking.



**#6102**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Crossings, lights, roundabouts.

**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 used to work when it was North Shore focused. With out it North Shore people wont go to games in the city. It supports Silverdale, Rodney and West Auckland. The complaint traffic is bad from the city is the same as North Shore people saying why go to Mt Smart/Eden Park/Pukekohe.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It is a revenue source. I do not believe the council can sell anything and use the money to build non-income generating assets. If they sell it what are they going to build that can clearly increase revenue.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Own the land and lease it to builders. The market will determine if Auckland needs a port, or needs to build a railway system to Tauranga (not Marsden)



**#6102**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Invest money to make money reduces future rate rises.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We can't self insure, the recent flood in Auckland highlights the risk that all our revenue generation is linked to our assets, if they are damaged we can not rebuild as we do not have the income.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 are increasingly reliant on over seas tourist money.

Limit the amount we import, by reducing the wharves. (Works physically and financially). To my knowledge Auckland port does not export any products?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Same as above.



#6102



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6102



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities



#6102



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.	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
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

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#6102**



It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance

#### **8. Do you have any other comments?**

I support optimal spending. Councils should focus on areas not supported by business. Having just paid \$38k for a water connection for two new properties to replace the existing one, the monopoly position of the council can be heavily leveraged. Things council provide should be charged for such as \$1M to connect a subdivision, \$50k for any new home, \$10,000 for new alcohol licenses. Councils should not charge for improvements in education, health and public transport (transport helps workers, students and infirm to travel and gives freedom). The council should not build a new road. Rates are entirely a household activity. Waste Water, Water and Sewerage can be charged to businesses based on metered usage. Businesses should not pay for parks, libraries, rubbish collections (they can hire private).



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Get rid of the beurocrats that run council services and stream line the business with effective user interactive technology

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6106**



meetings paying for hangers on to have paid lunches while they dismantle the Albany stadium that is being run at a loss by council morons

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Money has been wasted by Auckland Transport an unelected autocratic council department

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

shaking up AT deconstructing and readvertising the management positions

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Council meetings and councilors expenditure

## **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 was built by NTH Shore rate payers and stuffed up by council management. A prime example of mismanagement is the Council Parks. You should be able to book a site as long as there is space. One night stays should be accepted late notice with time restraints on the booking platform. The council loose money by mismanagement.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#6106**



**Tell us why:**

The shares after Covid should be making money 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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

if the ports are paying leases so that it makes money to fund other services we should proceed



#6106



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#6106



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Not Important
--	---------------



#6106



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.	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 more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do 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?

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.



**#6128**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

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:**



**#6128**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

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?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have 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:**



#6128



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6128



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#6128



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.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#6128**



It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

More of a focus on the needs of tamariki and rangatahi (who really aren't mentioned much at all in the draft LTP). Things that support tamariki and rangatahi health and wellbeing. In particular, a focus on equitable access to diverse play and recreation opportunities for all tamariki and rangatahi, acknowledging the fundamental



**#6130**



importance of play and having fun for their wellbeing. 20% of our population is under 15 years old and only 12% is over 65 years old, so let's ensure that our LTP actually caters for the needs of tomorrow's Aucklanders, and doesn't just worry about the priorities of the current generation of homeowners and retirees.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

No - we need to invest in our city to ensure that it, and all who live here, can grow and thrive.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't support stopping initiatives that support pedestrian movement and active modes. It's incredibly short-sighted to not invest in active modes, and the bias held by older motorists needs to be set aside in favour of the preferences and environmental concerns of younger Aucklanders. And our entire city should offer ample opportunities for pedestrians to move around safely, particularly for tamariki and rangatahi to be able to enjoy their neighbourhoods and travel independently. Even those of us who drive are also pedestrians, so investing in making our city more pleasant and safer for pedestrians benefits all of us.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More safe crossings, particularly to enable tamariki and rangatahi to walk safely to school and to access parks, playgrounds, and other recreational and play facilities in their neighbourhoods.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Anything that prioritises private motorists. Rather than dynamic lanes, set aside more lanes for public transport and active modes.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**



**#6130**



Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The North Shore population is growing rapidly and it is ludicrous to remove the stadium as a venue for large events.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#6130



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I support this as long as the priority is given to retaining most of the space a public land, providing plentiful and beautiful play and recreation opportunities in the central city for all Aucklanders to enjoy. We need to avoid creating more high-rise retirement communities on prime central city land, which is pretty much what the Wynyard Quarter has become. These spaces should be vibrant gathering places that draw Aucklanders into 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:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6130



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#6130



## 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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important



#6130



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?**

I'd like all local boards to continue focusing on the needs of all of their community, not just those who vote and pay rates. In particular, tamariki and rangatahi voice needs to be actively sought and respected.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

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.



**#6131**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

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:**



**#6131**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#6131



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in</p>	



#6131



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



#6131



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.	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.	Fairly Important



**#6131**



### **Tell us why**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

### **7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance

### **8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



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 continue council group operation 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?**



#6137



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6137



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support



#6137



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	



#6137



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?

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	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.



#6141



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

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:**

when it is gone, it is gone ..... finish it as was originally planned and be the iconic stadium it needs to be



**#6141**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#6141



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#6141



<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#6141



## 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.	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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



**#6141**



“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	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.



**#6148**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Spend on expensive walkways and cycle ways that do not get used by the public in any major capacity.

**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:**



**#6148**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**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:**



#6148



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6148



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#6148



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**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#6148**



It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6153**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Providing more parking at suburban bus stations

**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:**



**#6153**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have 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:**



#6153



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6153



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#6153



**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.	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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.



**#6153**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Build carparks near transport hubs to encourage more people to take public transport.

Regulate land developers more so that they pay more towards off-street carparking & stormwater improvements and so they develop responsibly ie. not use up all available space when building infill housing.



**#6168**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Raised pedestrian crossings & the unreasonable slowing of urban traffic which leads to driver impatience & road rage.

**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?**

network optimisation, reducing the effects of road works and enabling traffic to flow freely. Closer management of traffic contractors to improve efficiency and get road works done faster.

Also, cycleways.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings & contractor fees.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The operational structure needs changing, and the stadium needs redevelopment so it can fit the needs of the community. The stadium definitely needs to be kept.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6168**



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?**



#6168



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#6168



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	----------------



#6168



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.	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?**

If the number of local boards is reduced, I think it makes sense to merge the Devonport-Takapuna LB with Hibiscus & Bays rather than Kaipatiki - making the motorway the natural border, as this follows the current natural flow of the population.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6172**



· Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

· We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

· Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6172



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6172



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#6172



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	I don't know



#6172



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Free public transport for gold card and community services

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Remove ramp fees for boats. Remove Regional Fuel Excise.



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

China should be given the contracts

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Harbour Crossing

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Rubbish removal

**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:**

To many people

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6180**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

Increase cargo to rail lines. Decrease RUC charges for 5 years.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#6180



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6180



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Foreign investment in infrastructure

**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 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?

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.



**#6184**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Ineffective traffic lights, roundabouts and speed bumps that have been installed recently.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct



**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#6184



Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6184



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.



#6184



## 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



#6184



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

Install stand alone showers at each end of Mairangi Bay beach immediately.

Build a fit for purpose surf club. I visit Sydney beaches occasionally. Our facilities are a very poor cousin to theirs.



**#6205**



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

Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

More public rubbish bins collected more often at peak times

Eg. Weekends at the beach

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Road "safety" improvements including speed bumps

All non core essential services - stick to knitting!

**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?**



**#6205**



**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:**

Council has no business dabbling in airport or any other 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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:**



#6205



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6205



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.



#6205



Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our 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



#6205



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Fix the arteries! Roads and Park and Ride/Parking Infrastructure

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less focus on centre of the city. Let the regional suburbs develop more.



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Build roads via Public private partnerships

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Park and Ride infrastructure!

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Get rid of it, develop the land.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Just sell the assets

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Other

**Tell us here:**

Get rid of the port. Sell/develop the land

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 port spoils the Harbour. No need for it in Auckland 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:**

Get rid of the port!



#6214



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6214



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Lower rates please

**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
---	---------------



#6214



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?**

Road arteries need to be fixed, and park and bike ride infrastructure

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Council needs to know as a single mother, my belt is tightened as far as it ca be.



Council needs to live within it's means. It can't be one rule for the council and another for the people.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Once again, AT has had a never ending money pit which is not fiscally sustainable

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

NO

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less raised pedestrian crossings.....ratio of spend versus reported accidents is miles wide

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

There are many uses for this stadium, and the people in charge are being lazy

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#6220**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

Surely this would help Joe Bloggs with rates

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#6220



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6220



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#6220



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?**

The whole way things are funded needs to be re looked at - get people who are not on the gravy train to do a proper assessment. Ratepayers should have more say



#6242

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

My view is that the remaining AIAL shareholding should be sold, and the proceeds applied in reduction of debt.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I support the lease option, however on the basis that the upfront payment is used to reduce debt.



#6242



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#6242



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6242



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Not Important



#6242



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	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?



**#6248**



**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:**



#6248



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#6248



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6248



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6248



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?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the wages / salaries by completing a full staff restructure / redundancy plan



**#6287**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

With the WFH structures, there is little need to increase fast transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Encouraging children to walk to school, rather than being dropped off by parents

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Let's just have one Auckland Stadium on the waterfront, close to transport hubs

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



#6287



Shift the Port to Marsden Point ASAP.

**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



#6287



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6287



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6287



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**

**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 less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6290**



**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:**



#6290



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#6290



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6290



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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 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.	



**#6290**



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	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 unnecessary activities, focus on the core services required for a city to function.  
Less spend in community and arts.



**#6294**



**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:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:**



#6294



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#6294



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6294



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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



#6294



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	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6335**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

With the rate the Auckland region is growing, more people are commuting. Critical investment in this area is definitely required. Everyday, thousands of Aucklanders wasted so much time being stuck in traffic. Is this sustainable? An effective, affordable public transportation network will certainly help.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Please stop spending unnecessary money (which can millions) on useless working groups that only seem to enrich those contractors!

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

New Zealand is a sporting nation. We need to have good 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 to cash in on this investment and realising a capital gain. The proceeds can be used to reduce existing debts and also to reinvest in other areas.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6335**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Happy with the current situation for POAL.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Keep it. You need to stop possible increases in carbon footprints with all the transportation vehicles and such.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#6335



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6335



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Not Important



#6335



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?**

Looks about right to me. Nothing exciting.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I just like to say that those councillors at the Council and boards were elected to lead and manage on behalf of the people - folks like myself. We all pay rates, but paying increasing rates every single year is not the way to go, especially with a growing population in this Auckland city and hence more properties, the Council is also collecting more.

Please think out of the box. Please go and find out how other countries such as Singapore manage their local town services. I'm from Singapore originally and rates and similar taxes there are only raised once every few years and the increases are also small and manageable for the common folks. Singapore is a small country with



**#6335**



limited natural resources but yet it is being managed so efficiently and now has one of the highest GDP in the world.



#6368

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?**

Raised crossings, waste of time and money.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The North Shore needs a 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:**



#6368



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#6368



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#6368**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve on the storm water structure. Accessible transport (trains/busses)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce regional programs/events.



**#6386**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

better safer roads, better public transport, easier transport to the airport.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce cycle lanes.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Consider redeveloping.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#6386



Tell us 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



#6386



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#6386



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.
--

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Please ensure that council continue to provide quality services. Increase transportation.

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

### Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōtara-Papatoetoe in 2024/2025?**

I support all 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.	



#6386



<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>	
<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?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

In Mairangi bay where we live, the weeds along road gutters, footpaths and walkways are so overgrown that the whole suburb looks run down and shabby. Also, the town centre footpaths (cobble) are uneven, and no-one seems to care about litter that abounds on the footpaths and gutters. We should have regular weed spraying and



**#6410**



removal, with vegetation overhanging and impeding footpaths and walkways regularly cut back. The town centre should have a Council employee or contractor along weekly to sweep the paths and gutters, like the old NSCC used to do.

**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:**

AT's traffic calming measures are mostly unnecessary and a waste of money. We agree with the Mayor's public comments on the overuse of road cones/traffic management. We are regular users of public transport (the 83 & 856 bus routes) which is excellent for where we live.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Get the Rosedale station up and running and connect the 907 to it. Perhaps make it an entire loop starting and finishing at Constellation Station with buses running each way.

**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:**

Residents of the North Shore fought long and hard to have a stadium on the Shore and want to see it retained. Improving the operational management to ensure greater



**#6410**



use of the facilities is to be encouraged. Selling some of the land is not something we agree with.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 think it the proposal is a good idea.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The ROI from Council ownership of the Port has been poor over several years, and a better ROI should be obtained by retaining ownership of the land and leasing for 35 years.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Like the idea of a future fund to cover climate emergencies and such like.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#6410



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

The proposal has merit but where would the cruise ships berth? Should we not have a proper terminal for say two cruise ships?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Subject to comments above regarding a proper cruise ship terminal for the Port.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6410



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

We strongly support green waste weekly collections and two weekly rubbish collections but want the pay as you throw system for waste collection retained, because we only put our waste bin out between 4 & 5 times per annum. We don't like the idea of a fixed rate.



#6410



## 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	Fairly Important



#6410



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**

We are keen walkers in the area and would like to see several paths (especially the cliff top walkway to Murrays Bay and path below Forde Way, which are now dangerous (sideways sloped and uneven - difficult to negotiate safely for older citizens).

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

We agree.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Would like to see greater ability for local boards to have more discretionary spending authority and appointment of locals to manage its parks, reserves and communal 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	
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?

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.



**#6425**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6425**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#6425



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



#6425



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to

**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



#6425



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?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

More pedestrian and bicycle routes

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6436**



In fill Housing

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Please keep growth of public transport initiatives

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#6436



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#6436



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#6436



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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



#6436



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?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#6440**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6440



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6440



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#6440



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#6440



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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance



**#6440**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

My wife and daughter are both lifeguards, and my youngest daughter will qualify as a lifeguard next year. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club is an essential and valuable service that needs to be supported in our community.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve library funding

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less funding for major events



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

AT is bloated. The head count needs to be decreased, They need to start listening to the public. The buses need to run on time and as scheduled. There would be a massive change if AT staff were told to catch the bus to get to work!

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

I do not agree with paying for park and ride. This will decrease patronage.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

I would like to see the proposal first but existing teams e.g. North Harbour rugby must still be accommodated and NO land must be sold. All playing fields must stay.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Mayor Brown campaigned on moving the port. This is NOT what is being proposed. He needs to stick to his promise as this is why he was elected.



**#6463**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the operation will not allow the port to be moved.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The port needs to be told to get their act together and increase their dividend.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Move the port - redevelop the land for public use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#6463



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Move the port - redevelop the land for public use.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Do not support



#6463



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#6463



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**

More power and money to the local board.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Fix Glenvar Road!

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

work with educational/professional entities to run more free entry/professional level events , prioritize on enabling local people on more future enabled capabilities; it can be universities, big corps, big commerce associations, it will build their reputation as while as their relation with the council as an important part of the city . Locals Kiwis will have more chances to be exposed to both entry and professional level information.



The main idea is the council as a leader of a city will bring more players to the long term plan.

**1d. Is there anything else 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?**

public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

more hosted events, this would cover the maintenance cost. Put that (more events) to KPI of running 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)?**

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:**

Depending on the lease terms, it would be better to have a consistency between the 10yr plan and 35yr lease, meaning the lease would be better to have some terms that guarantee the integrity between city's 10yr 20yr 30yr plan , otherwise council will cancel the lease . Other terms would also cover things like the lease will guaranteed the high income/dividen from the operating party, say , if avg return is less than 5% in last 2 yrs, council will have the right to terminate the contract etc

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#6484



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6484



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

NETR will help to build a better and unique New Zealand which makes it the best place for living

**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?**



#6484



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?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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)?**

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:**



#6520



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#6520



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6520



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6520



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	
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?

Less roads, more public transport, and we need 3 Waters

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6521**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need raised pedestrian crossings too to keep our kids safe.

**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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keep airport shares.

It's vital infrastructure that needs to be NZ owned.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#6521



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment 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



#6521



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#6521



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6521



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**

Our environment is collapsing and these measures will support the transition to adapting.

**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?**



#6526

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

1d. Is there anything else 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:**

Get rid of T2 and T3 lanes no one car pools if you had more lanes there would be less congestion - it's pure revenue collecting.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

getting rid of T2 and T3 lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

definitely the pedestrian crossings they are a joke

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

if it was managed properly in the first place it wouldn't be in this situation.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?**



#6526



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#6526



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#6526



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6526



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?**

our rates money should not be to provide any such free entertainment such as movies in parks etc - I don't want my rates money spent on these things - people can pay even if just a bare minimum to cover the cost price - I don't know any other rate payer that supports 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?

Do less (reduce 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?

Cut back on STAFF

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cut back on Busses that run half empty



**#6538**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Remove some Traffic lights and raised crossings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Not at all

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

To many Traffic Cones about

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Build housing Complex

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 pay down DEBT



**#6538**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

For more 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?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:**



#6538



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6538



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#6538



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**

**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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce spending on expensive Annual Reports and other similar printed and e-docs by the council and in particular by its CCOs. Some of these would be the envy of listed corporates and have obviously involved extensive graphic design, and internal staff



**#6542**



and external comms advisers to produce at I suggest excessive cost given the audiences for and purpose of these documents and their e-versions.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

The role of the CBD in Auckland has diminished and sub-regional centres have increased in importance, and there has also been a permanent shift to businesses locating closer to key shareholders/employees across the city. The geography of Auckland and the relatively low and dispersed population size is such that there will be a perpetual need for private cars/delivery vans, etc., where PT is not otherwise a viable option so proposals for central congestion zone charging where there are no bypass alternatives will inevitably lead to the congestion levies disproportionately falling on those with lower incomes and small businesses involved in services and deliveries, etc across the city

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Tunnel for light rail feeder between downtown Auckland transport interchange and underneath the northern busway to link with initial current transport interchanges for buses.

### **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:**



**#6542**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 has limited control of or input to governance or stewardship of AIAL beyond normal shareholder input. There are future risks from landing fees regulation, capital expenditure for development and regulation of related returns, management performance, etc., all of which will affect dividends. There would be a better sustained return from investment of the funds in a diversified portfolio.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Retain underlying Council ownership of the land and charge POAL a lease fee for the use of the land to improve incentives to optimise the footprint (biased to a higher fee for use of Bledisloe/Marsden/Captain Cook wharves).

Relist the residual operating company of POAL (without land) on the NZX selling all Council resulting shares except for a retention of a 25.1% blocking stake for major transactions and invest the share sale proceeds in the diversified investment fund. Since the port was delisted it has suffered from a lack of external oversight by brokers and investors and the inadequate stewardship and governance of the company and its Board by Council. POAL has as a result performed poorly relative to other listed ports such as POT, etc.

**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:**



#6542



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The fund should be able to be managed by the Council treasury department overseeing the contracted external investment managers. There is no need to set up a new CCO to hold the investments and/or to govern POAL. Eke Panuku certainly should not have a role in oversight of POAL within one of the proposed sub-options - it does not have the requisite skills or experience to do this and the Council itself hasn't demonstrated competent stewardship or governance of the company.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

See above re separating land from POAL and for them to pay a weighted lease fee and to rest the residual POAL operating company. Over time POAL with proper incentives in place will shrink and reallocate its use of these wharves as they can shift cargo to other modes or to use other ports and transport alternatives at an optimal time, without adversely affecting freight flows or businesses reliant on these wharves if Council prematurely restricts use before alternatives are in place. That is not to say that Council when it restructures the land could exclude Captain Cook from port use to enable earlier development including extended ferry and cruise operations

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

See above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment 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



#6542



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#6542



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?**

The upper management pay level tiers and employment numbers at these tier levels for some of the CCOs seems excessive and also for the main Council body itself (notwithstanding no doubt numerous external benchmark surveys by remuneration consultants justifying the pay increases over time, we need to pay the best to get the best, etc....!!) but at the end of the day this is the public service not private sector with all the attendant risks and scope involved in equivalent positions. There seem to be inconsistencies where Tataki Auckland Unlimited and Eke Panuku levels are on a par with Watercare and AT despite these being quantum larger organisations. Similarly with director fees which are now quite high given these are Council subsidiaries and inconsistent as well comparing the smaller CCO levels with that of the larger CCOs. Board sizes seem high. Same issue for the largely public funded Auckland Museum of excessive salaries, numbers at salary levels, size of Board and level of director fees. Same prior point made for all of these with excessive spend on expensively produced Annual reports (printed and e-versions) and other document sets given the purpose and the audiences. I believe it is questionable whether TAU should be involved in business sectors at all for economic development work (such as in technology, innovation systems, manufacturing, etc.) but consider TAU should continue to focus on its role in tourism, events attraction, etc. which have direct and quantifiable benefits and as result further cost savings could be generated. This is all at a time when the Council, households and businesses are suffering from inflation and the remedies, so everyone expects the Council (and its CCOs) to seriously reduce costs across the Board



**#6542**



wherever possible, and believe further savings are possible over and above what is incorporated in this current plan out for consultation.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Provide a community space in Long Bay and a fenced dog exercise area somewhere on the North Shore.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6557**



Fewer cycle lanes. They are a waste of money as hardly anyone uses them.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Agree regarding cycleways they are an expensive luxury only a few can enjoy.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Fenced dog exercise areas on the North Shore as there are none.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is a huge asset that is only losing money through poor management. Put in a management company who will actually make money from 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?**



#6557



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

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



#6557



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#6557



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#6557



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**

All these initiatives seem quite open and undefined. What practical services and initiatives are being provided such as providing a bookable community space in Long Bay and a fenced dog exercise area on the North Shore.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

See above

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As 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?

Expensive IT consultants



**#6575**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Disappointed to see less funding for cycleways

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways and safe lanes for cycling on main roads

**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:**

Allow more use other than just by specific elite teams

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

It is hard to know whether moving towards a diversified fund approach is best given you would be divesting ownership/share in key infrastructure that Auckland and NZ relies upon.



**#6575**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Need to find funds somehow to invest in Auckland's future.

**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:**

Council needs to determine where it is needed most.

**4d. Do you have 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:**

Most large cities do not have their port in the centre of downtown, so hard to know what is best. Again, I think Auckland Council needs to determine what gives Auckland City, the Council, and ratepayers the best overall returns.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#6575



**Tell us why:**

See answer to 5a.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6575



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Make sure the rubbish & recycling fees are reasonable as people's needs vary. Not interested in massive rates hikes for extensive changes. Needs to be important and rise gradually wherever possible.

**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?**



#6575



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Agree in general, but would like to see continued support for community service organisations in the DTLB area.

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**



#6575



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.	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?**

Would like to see continued support for community service charities in the UPLB area.



#6575



## 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?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	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.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Very Important



#6575



Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Would like to see continued support for community service charities in KPLB area.

**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.	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.	Not Important



#6575



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?**

Would like to see continued support for community service charities in UHLB area.

**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?**

Private business sponsorship

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Public transport that is environmentally friendly and affordable so that numbers using it will naturally increase to take pressure off roading infrastructure and the environment.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6588**



Council should be more decisive after consultation with planning and design experts and consultation with its ratepayers when the future of the waterfront, port assets and possible stadium are concerned. Pay less by limiting options and deciding.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Very keen on maximizing efficient public transport and fewer cars at grid lock times. Also like how dynamic lanes work as on Whangaparaoa road.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Electrification of transport options ,bike lanes, environmentally friendly options.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road cones,speed bumps,more roads.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct,Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

I feel it could be better marketed for more frequent and larger events to improve economics . Develop a system whereby it is suitable for both smaller and larger events,physically and operationally we can't continue with the present model but waste to demolish and start again.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6588**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I usually want the council to hold on to its assets but this is a small holding and economically probably a better option if in a diversified fund. Not so sure would want to give up Port investments as look where Bank profits disappear to.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Concern over 2 billion put into growth fund to make money for the council but the taxpayer doesn't necessarily have rates stabilizing or other improvements and heaven forbid it becomes a slush fund for future mayor's.

i could agree if legally not able to access capital, just interest to carry put projects,keep rates stable.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I'm guessing we need as much as possible to fund infrastructure that needs upgrading,flood protection etc

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#6588



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

An efficiently working Port is desirable to provide jobs and services to the most populated city in NZ. Concentrate on efficient management . Using trucks to deliver goods from another port is double handling and more reliance on upkeep of road infrastructure.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6588



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?**



#6588



## 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



#6588



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**

Concerns with quality of life of residents by looking after the environment are worthwhile.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Ok

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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.



**#6653**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6653



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6653



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#6653



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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

Fairly Important



#6653



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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:**

More pedestrian and bicycle lanes.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More pedestrian and bicycle lanes.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

More 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:**

Stop satisfying developers' greed.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Stop selling valuable assets and stock.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6659**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Stop satisfying developers' greed.

**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:**

Build more houses outside the current residential zones and stop with this high density madness that destroys all the suburbs with countless low-quality coffins built by Asian developers.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#6659



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#6659



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#6659



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.	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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Environment protection

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Not do any free movies or music in the parks



**#6661**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Mostly good

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

New cycle routes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings, stick with normal ones

**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:**

Host large music concerts rugby matches which bring in lots of money and save environmental pollution on buses and cars when people go to eden park.who live north 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It will bring in future money for the next generation



**#6661**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Keeps ownership for future generations

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 income now

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Too expensive to redevelop at moment

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#6661



Tell us why:

Too expensive to redevelop

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6661



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	------------------



#6661



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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

They are goid

**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



**#6661**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6693**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6693



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6693



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#6693



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#6693



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.	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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#6694**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6694



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6694



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



#6694



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#6694



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.	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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6710**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#6710**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



#6710



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6710



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#6710



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.	
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

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.



**#6710**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do less
Council support	Do 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:**

Auckland is the main financial centre and the 'entrance gate' to NZ, as such the government needs to support financially the needs of AUK.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#6721



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#6721



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6721



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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



#6721



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	
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?

1d. Is there anything else 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?**

Cycle lanes and raised crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The idea of reconfiguring as a home for test cricket is a good one and it would be nice to see some concerts happen north of the bridge

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#6767



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#6767



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6767



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#6767



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?**

Of minor importance given the big challenges Auckland faces

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is a fantastic facility which just needs to be operated 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)?**

**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:**



#6772



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#6772



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#6772



## 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
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



**#6772**



Long Bay has developed rapidly but is severely lacking community facilities catering to the elderly, teenagers and young kids. Outside of the reserve there is 1 small park for the kids to play in. We need a hall for local events and an area for teen to use (similar to the Mangawhai Activity Zone).

**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	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Community service place, for example, our Long Bay community needs more public activity spaces and venues. We used to have a good children's bicycle path, but now it's gone.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6785**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Dynamic lanes are great, especially since traffic on the North Shore is so bad

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**



#6785



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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.

I don't know



#6785



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6785



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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, 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.	
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	



#6785



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?**

## 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	



#6785



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?**

Please consider adding public service places and children's entertainment venues to the Long Bay community.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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.



**#6797**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6797



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	
--	--



#6797



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



**#6797**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#6797



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.	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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”



**#6797**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

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.



**#6799**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6799**



Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.



#6799



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



**#6799**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#6801

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

### 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?**



#6801



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#6801



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#6801



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	Not Important



#6801



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	As proposed
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 life saving 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. due to this the auckland region risks losing volunteers who provide the services. which could cause the end of more than 100 years of vigilance on our beaches. we therefore request that the auckland council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the long term plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds



**#6802**



and ongoing maintenance of surf life saving club facilities as per surf life saving northern regions surf 10:20 capital development proposal. Mairangi bay surf life saving club has existed in its current location for 70 years. the current membership comprises 150 active lifeguards over 500 junior surf children aged 6-14 and a further 600 associate members. the building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities a new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



#6802



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#6802



<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 <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#6802



With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

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



#6802



<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	

**Tell us why**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?



**#6809**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings are a big waste of time, money and emergency access.  
Cycle lanes good for 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?**

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:**



#6809



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:

putting a date on the transfer to council when we can't predict the future is daring!

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#6809



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6809



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#6809



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.	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**

**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 less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

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?**



#6811



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6811



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#6811



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Very Important



#6811



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?**

They need to fix the storm water issues on the coast... our beaches are getting worse and 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?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	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?



**#6815**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I believe the only way to have a sustainable city is to have commonly used public transport. Removing subsidies for the "next generation" is counter productive - it is already hard enough to break the cycle of reliance on cars in NZ without discouraging PT usage in youth.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport, as above.

### 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 stadium has the potential to be a fantastic asset to the city and the Shore - it has great capacity AND transport links with the nearby bus station and motorway. If it is demolished or reduced, it will never get reinstated and the opportunity will be lost. It needs better, dedicated management who will be more active in running and developing 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:



**#6815**



I think the airport should be part of an integrated transport solution 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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Immediately spending windfall income is ALWAYS short sighted. Investing in a fund leads to a more sustainable long term vision.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

POAL is a wart on the waterfront of the City of Sails. Auckland as a city should be looking to maximise the attractiveness of one of it's greatest assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#6815



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

POAL is a wart on the waterfront of the City of Sails. Auckland as a city should be looking to maximise the attractiveness of one of it's greatest assets.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#6815



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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?**



#6815



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**

**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): Pinewoods Holiday Park

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	
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6817**



**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:**

Not in our sphere of 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:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#6817



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

Support



#6817



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#6817



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#6817



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	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?

Bike racks on public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Raised crossings



**#6822**



Bus lanes - the buses hardly use them and it causes traffic congestion

Remove the lights off motorway onramps - causes congestion

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Raised crossings - waste of vehicle energy and causes damage to vehicles plus expensive to put in and repair

Bus lanes - the buses hardly use them and it causes traffic congestion

Remove the lights off motorway onramps - causes congestion

Create more free turning to enable traffic free flow onto road and highways

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Covered secured area for bicycles at bus terminal - e.g. caged area with AT card access - example Perth Australia

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Excess expenses on bus and cycle lanes

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Multipurpose use and no other options locally

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Its a long term income

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 means that if in the next 35 years there is a decision to redevelop the area it cannot be done. What happened to the option of moving the port so that the transport is out of the city environment

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Keep the city running better as it is already battling to keep funding at a financially sustainable level

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#6822



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6822



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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 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?

Put a hold on cultural, arts, sports & recreation until the council is better off financially.



**#6823**



Leave the libraries as is, with the closing of the council offices in Browns Bay the library has been forced to pick up council duties.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

The North Shore has only buses for public transport. Improve the bus shelters to provide shelter from the weather.

A better located bus stop was going to be installed in Stredwick Drive, Torbay over 2 years ago. We received three (3) letters advising of commencement date, but nothing happened.

If you are going to waste our money & time on consultation & do nothing, please cease immediately.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Bus shelters to provide protection from the weather.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

STOP installing the speed bumps. A complete waste of money.

examples:- On the corner of Beach Road & Bute Road, Browns Bay there are 3 of them within a few meters of each other. In Oteha Valley Road by the Mobil petrol station you have installed speed bumps on only one side of the road. Do you think people are going to speed only in one direction?

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**



**#6823**



The stadium isn't used much, also the council has forced users of the conference rooms to pay for parking!!!!!!!!!!!! This is a major deterrent & expense for all users.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 has to increase their financial strength anyway they can, considering their continual wastage of buying pieces of land - over \$50 million for one field.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Could be a good source of continual income, albeit drip fed.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

My fear is the Council could waste rate payers money by installing an events centre on the waterfront. Unless the council can prove 120%, there will be able to do it to budget (very doubtful) & it will be a profitable venture, very doubtful in the current & foreseeable economic climate.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#6823



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 it ain't broke, don't fix it.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

A 15 year plan before any benefits will be seen is far too long. The proposal doesn't have any solid planning.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6823



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#6823



## 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.	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



#6823



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**

It is more important to provide the main services for ALL residence & not just a few.

Concentrate on the roads & infrastructure.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It is the council's job to provide the necessities for a properly run community.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#6830**



**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:**



#6830



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6830



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#6830



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	
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	



#6830



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?

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.



**#6848**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6848



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6848



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#6848**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#6849**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6849



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#6849



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#6849**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Rationalise council management roles and salaries.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less Hui and more Do-ey.



**#6867**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Invest in making the current infrastructure work before building new infrastructure work.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Get busses to run on-time, make it cheaper to bus into the city than to drive.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Drop the eco-transport nonsense. Aucklanders aren't buying the rhetoric.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management, Other

### Tell us why:

Other dedicated sport centres have proven their value to the community. Convert the are into a dedicated sports area. Look at the success of North Harbour Netball Centre, Harbour Hockey Centre with multiple fields. Why not have have a Harbour Rugby Centre, or Harbour Football Centre, or Harbour Cricket centre.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#6867**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 does not have good track record of generating profits.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Lease the operation of the port.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other



#6867



**Tell us why:**

Lyttelton Generated 200 million in one weekend on the SailGP which Auckland passed up. Auckland is known has the sailing capital of New Zealand but does not have a dedicated sailing event facility. This could be a world-leading income generator for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#6867



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Stop using the North Shore as an cash cow to fund other districts which pay less rates yet receive benifits funded by North Shore 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?**



#6867



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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

What's in it for the actual residents? Who's agenda is the council promoting?

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

There is no mention of the maintenance of sewage system so our children aren't swimming in excrement or a plan to provide the infrastructure required to manage the urban intensification strategy? Personally I think it does not address any of the hard issues that residents actually wan't to see action on.



**#6867**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Resident's are tired of paying for Mayoral legacies, tired of being taxed more but recieving less services. Tired of vague political statments that never amount to anything other than draining our pockets.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Decriminalisation activities in support of Police and other law enforcement. There are civic amenities that could help divert youth energy

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6884**



Offshore non-critical functions. Repurpose staff.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop funding minority activities such as cycle ways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Bus lane infrastructure

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cross walk, cycle and walking path improvements

**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:**

While the future fund is a great idea, our current needs outstrip the future fund investments which could be attracted from other sources

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Port operations will only increase over time. Our roading is already under pressure, it makes sense to retain more POAL capacity in the absence of a concrete Bledisloe terminal plan by Council

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#6884



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6884



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#6884



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.	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 more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Actually do what you used to do, we're paying more money for less services already.  
Cut down committees, sub committees and free lunches.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



See above

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The public transport where I live is abysmal and also dangerous for young people after dark.

Cycle lanes are seldom used, speed humps where we don't need them.

## 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Motorway lanes.

## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Meetings, overseas trips and lunches.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

Its fine the way it is and seldom full.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know



**#6885**



**Tell us why:**

Im not sure without looking into it further. It depends how you spend the money which so far doesn't look very good.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Not enough info

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Not enough info.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Aren't sea levels rising ?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#6885



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Fine the way it is.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	I don't know



#6885



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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
--	------------------



#6885



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?**

Given the population explosion in this area Im surprised these are Council 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6907**



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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

move the port out of Auckland and redevelop the area

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#6907



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6907



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#6907



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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 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



#6907



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 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?

Nothing require paying more for. Reducing wastage and negotiating proper contracts for efficient outcomes is what's required.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6916**



Stop wasting and embezzling tax and rate-payer money on ideological driven outcomes. Stop race-based funding initiatives. We are not a separatist or communist country.

**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:**

The stadium should be used for major events. Currently it's potential is being wasted.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland Council cannot be trusted not to waste or steal additional funding.

There is no concrete proof to the basis of some of the initiatives outlined in the first place. It looks like another scheme to take tax and rate-payer money and redistribute it.



**#6916**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Lease part of the operation with provisions to ensure the local area is not impacted, and do not put it towards the Auckland Future Fund. Put it towards the roading and transport development.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Use the profits for more important initiatives. They could be used on a plan to optimize the efficiency of the highest voted rate-payer funded projects

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#6916



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#6916



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Stop wasting money on nonsense, people are so sick of it that they are at the point of withholding rates.

**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?

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	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?

Replace hot mix with hot mix & mow the grass in the park just like NSCC did prior to supercity

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Stop ESG, cultural, ideological \*\*\*\*\*.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Council cant be trusted to manage or be prudent.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#6953**



**Tell us here:**

The port is a monopoly cash cow, other competitors cant grow geographically- just keep sucking the port & the customers dry like you are.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Keep concillors away from poal dividends, as said before the council is a useless pack of ideological lefties. Mayor Brown for president.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Just stop wasting money. Raised ped crossings etc. im over you low wattage people.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Our population keeps growing, we keep importing \*\*\*\*\*, which mostly comes to akl. At \$100 per car wharfage, its a money printer.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

See above, the port needs to grow not shrink.



#6953



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6953



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Fairly Important



#6953



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**

If Use of my scooter can be made safer, all good, but dont care for unnecessary expenditure.

**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?**

Traffic & pedestrian safety has been overtaken by ideological zealots at extreme cost. Dumbing down the population does nothing to help productivity or society.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?



**#6956**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

New motorways within city limits should continue to be opposed.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The land is very valuable in this area. Very close to the bus station and jobs, retail and activities. This would be an excellent walkable neighbourhood for the area and prove to New Zealand this kind of living environment is possible.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Diversifying and creating a wealth fund is good long term thinking. Some shares in AIAL should be kept.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6956**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Continuing ownership of the land is critical. Reducing the period of time would be desirable, but I understand the private company may not wish to invest in a shorter timeframe.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:**

Develop these areas into liveable walkable neighbourhoods.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#6956



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#6956



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#6956



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?

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?



**#6961**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you 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 needs to be smaller capacity and made for cricket it is dumb how it is currently

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



#6961



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#6961



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

Keep chipping away at major infrastructure regardless of rates rises, like underground/overground rail (light rail??). It will never get cheaper and I'd rather pay \$500 million over 10 years than \$900 million as a one off in 10 years time when it is urgently needed for the same thing.



**#6980**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Revenue generating asset sales, especially like North Harbour Stadium which is only a lame duck through poor management. The previous board ran it well and only when it went under direct council management did it turn to garbage.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Think it's a hard sell to reduce lower performing bus services then charge for parking at the same time (although I'm fine with fair and reasonable rates for parking at stations). Why are we obsessed with large buses on feeder routes? Hong Kong for example uses smaller buses for feeders to stations. These have to be superior in every way outside of rush hour (where higher frequency or bigger buses could be used).

Also, public transport is difficult in our sprawled out city when you live on the shore and work in say Highbrook. You can get there, but with a number of transfers and unrealistically longer than driving, even in traffic. How can we speed this up is a big question for you.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Underground/Overground trains (light rail??) (coupled with housing density close to stations). Might be expensive now, but will not get any cheaper and will become more popular as the network expands.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways outside of major routes. Ones like the cycle lane that runs down the side of the Northwestern, or runs from Oteha to Constellation are great, but elsewhere we have more important things to spend money on I think.

Speed tables in stupid places as well, e.g. Oteha Valley Rd by the school. It was put in to slow cars in case they didn't see the red light and kids crossing (according to someone who contacted council), however it has caused a more significant hazard



**#6980**



than before. If people can't see a red light and kids crossing they sure as heck aren't going to see a speed table and will hit it and lose control.

### **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 was well utilised under previous board management. It's a bit rough saying it is not used when the current board doesn't seem to even try doing anything with it. As a shore resident, it is frustrating when this stadium is left to ruin and bypassed for most events when it has great parking, is very close to a public transport hub, close to entertainment (mall and restaurants), and close to the AKL Motorway system (all directions). I'd rather council close the iconic Western Springs stadium seeming they allowed a miniscule percentage of locals ruin that permanently.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 wealth fund is a no brainer. You say if major funds are taken out for a reason then returns fall which is obvious. You don't say (or I didn't see) whether the council will continue to invest in this fund in the good times to keep it growing, nor did I see if you plan to build it back up (through investing) after a major event. I would hope so, as the more it grows, the better it clearly serves our future generations.

I am against the sale of shares in the airport as I feel we are robbing future generations for a healthy handfull of years. Surely dividends over 50 years outweighs a sale now (unless reinvested and we don't get to spend it anyway).

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6980**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 I just ticked yes for option 3??? We should continue to run the port ourselves as successfully as possible. Whilst I think the investment fund needs to continue to grow, I think the dividends from this should be spent smartly as opposed to reinvested.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 long as the fund is growing through other means, using the dividend on services makes sense otherwise why keep it.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Self insurance is a great idea, especially with insurance premiums continuing to head upwards with increases in major events, and more and more restrictions on what they'll pay out for (meaning central or local government often has to pay anyway).

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 2 wharves could be used for significant benefit and returns compared to current use.



#6980



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The potential cost outweighs the currently known benefit. It could be used for something amazing, but this has clearly not been explored to the point of declaring it in the LTP. The cost though of having to freight in more goods, and the permanent reduction in port land affecting operations is not worth it unless we decide now that we are moving the port and using land ports north and south as hubs.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#6980



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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



#6980



**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.	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**

The continual strengthening of our resilience, natural environment, and acceptance and celebration of our diverse cultures is very important for harmony, health, and dealing with increasing major weather events. Developing use of our public spaces is important but not to the same degree in my opinion.



**#6980**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I agree, particularly around roading in the Long Bay / Torbay area with the ongoing growth in the Long Bay development. I live on Deep Creek Rd and saw first hand (and was affected by) the impact of Glenvar Rd being closed. More and better built accessibility to Long Bay / Okura can only help to calm traffic at least until it reaches main arterials.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



**#6983**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

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)?**



#6983



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#6983



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



#6983



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#6983



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.



**#6983**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better Roding infrastructure. Less on cycle and pedestrian keep traffic moving in the suburbs and main arterial routs.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6991**



Reduce spending on the arts museums and non-essential items. Keep council more focused on the essential items such as roading, waste and water supplies.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Speed humps in road should be designed for the speed limit i.e. 50 km/hr not 25 as most are. Make pedestrian crossing more visible (Hi-vis beacons) there is no need for raised crossing, when you are there its too late.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Road maintenance.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Arts etc&lt; cycle and pedestrian ways.

## **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 fees to hire the stadium are too high, make them more reasonable. Make the stadium more user friendly ie for schools 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



**Tell us why:**

Keep the airport, and its assets, it could be a good source of income in future years and it gives council some control over its 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:**

Make the port more usable by cruise ships, especially the larger ones, or cruise ships will go to other 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:**

The port requires the area. Put more rail into the port and reduce the number of trucks.



#6991



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#6991



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Council should focus on the core elements such as roading, transport, water and wastewater and reduce spending on non-essential items such as the arts,

## 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?**



#6991



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.	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**

Council should go back to the essentials, roading, water and waste water stop spending on non-essential items.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It requires a complete review and overhaul. see what the public wants, we pay the rates.



**#6991**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I think i have said it all, GO BACK TO THE 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?

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?



**#6993**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I prefer cycleways and public transport to be prioritised over cars. So would rather see cycleways continue to be funded.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways - if we had a joined up cycle network this would enable more active transport and get cars off the road. They need to be separated from cars in most cases for safety.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

It's a bit of a white elephant. Keep the playing field and redevelop the rest 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:

I believe both the airport and the port are assets of strategic importance to Auckland, not just as an investment. So we should keep some voting rights on both these



**#6993**



organisations. Not opposed to the idea of a fund more generally, but I think strategic assets should be retained for the long term even if not profiting council much currently.

**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:**

I think a Future Fund is a good idea.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:**



#6993



Strategically important to retain an operational port in Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#6993



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#6993



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**

**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?**

**Tell us 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:**



#6996



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#6996



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I like what you have proposed,

But I would like no dogs on public beaches.

one beach specifically for dogs as they have in Christchurch also an area for them in open country where they can roam free..

The mess that they deposit is revolting. Most owners have no control over their dogs.

Otherwise I wish you all well and I like the Mayor as he doesn't waffle but hits to the core straight away. He has my support and I wish his councillors would support him more as some of them shouldn't even be councillors



#6996



## 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.	
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	



#6996



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?**

No dogs on our beaches.

A beach kept specifically for dogs and area where they can frolic in the open spaces.. the seagulls were there before the dogs as they think it is great fun to chase them..

what a great job the Mayor is doing keep it steady as it goes.

A moreetoteumon for no shell fishing as the beaches as they have been raped.

People take knives down to the beach to pry out the tiniest creatures.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#7002**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making the flow of people and goods faster and more efficient has to be good. This DOESN'T included car damaging bumps in roads to save, perhaps, one life a year!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bike lanes - only ever used by recreational riders and a colossal waste of money. I was told be one biker, whom a said should be using the expensive Northcote motorway cycle overbridge "I didn't ask for it!".

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We shouldn't lose it, redevelopment may encourage more to use it. If made suitable for concerts it is much better placed than Eden Park as far as effects on the neighbours is concerned.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

11% of Auckland Airport isn't enough to influence its direction, getting a better return on the Port would be good. That said, a 7.5% return on the fund looks very optimistic and the sort of figure someone might use to make the rest of the figures work as they want ...



**#7002**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 keeps the land, frees money to better use elsewhere.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Building a future fund is a good idea in principle.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

If the Port doesn't NEED them, why does it have them? I would not want to see them developed such that public access is limited.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#7002



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

As Auckland grows it will require more Port space, not less. Bringing materials etc. from another port by road (really bad) or rail (not quite so bad) is a very climate unfriendly thing to do. Ever thought of setting a limit to the growth of the city??

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#7002



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?



#7002



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.	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**

If people want to show off their culture they should fund it themselves.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Not much different to the above.



**#7002**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The Council needs to require those who disrupt roads or footpaths for whatever purposes, such as telecommunications companies, Watercare, power companies, whoever, to restore the work area to how it was. This does NOT mean putting asphalt where there were concrete pavers, or inept repairs of footpaths and roads. If the Council does not have legal power to do this, it should seek a law change to enable it. There would be a reduction in Council funded "upgrades" to such areas, many of which are only required because of the \*\*\*\*\* repairs made by others.

Oh, and having a system in place so if "A" is going to dig a channel across a road "B" & "C" are informed that they can do it now or are restricted from doing so for two years might be an idea too!



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Protecting and restoring the Hauraki Gulf, get serious about it

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7012**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

100% focus on moving people. Make getting and maintaining HOP cards easier than worry about every possible payment method

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Park and ride infrastructure and connecting satellite transport. It shouldn't be drive, maybe park, walk, etc....., it needs to be as seamless as possible to change behaviour.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Accept the realities of what cycling will be used for, but make it safe

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Don't allow poor past decisions and management destroy a significant asset. Lack of integrated Transport options has been the big killer.

A North Shore resident can easily catch a bus to an Eden Park event (often included in the ticket price). What can a City resident do to get to a North Harbour event, if there was one

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



**#7012**



**Tell us why:**

Its not a core Asset

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The Port operation is not a key asset

**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:**

Proided there is a strong focus on retaining and extending water transport services

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#7012



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#7012



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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	I don't know
--	--------------



#7012



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.	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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

The short-term plans of the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board appear the weakest of all the boards. Its hard to support just very general fluffy statements with no detail as to specific actions ina short term plan. I do sympathise if they dont know what the budgets are, ie what can they support?

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Everything starts with the word "advocate". Again hard to suggest anything else with out concrete local board budgets



**#7012**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

As a general rule "user pays" focuses attention on what people really want



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do 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 bins put them back and increase collection

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less cultural activities



**#7014**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We can't afford to have more traffic congestion

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

another bridge/ tunnel

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Indigenous cultural separation one country for every one

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Waste of land should be redeveloped to a council run retirement 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:**

No need for council to run it

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#7014**



Other

**Tell us here:**

Move out of cbd private owned

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**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?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Privatise Move it out of cbd

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#7014



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#7014



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

### 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.	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



#7014



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.	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**

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	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:**

It looks like a less wasteful 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:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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's broke. We need good sensible investments that offer great returns

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 proposal Auckland needs money for further investments



**#7021**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 needs future development funds at the rate this city is growing it needs to keep up. If its a vibrant modern city more investors and skilled workers will be drawn to living here. At the moment central Auckland needs an upgrade of many of its services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Not too sure but if any proposal guarantees significant financial benefits to Auckland Council then I'm all for it

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

As long as Bledisloe Terminal brings in money or makes money long term for the council then I support change; if not then no

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#7021



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#7021



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#7021



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**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Positive

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#7026**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7026



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#7026



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#7026



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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

Fairly Important



#7026



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.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#7027**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7027



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#7027



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



#7027



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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

Very Important



#7027



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.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I want money get refunded if council do less, I will arrange my own rubbish bin service.



**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?**

Second harbour bridge

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Offer for community activities

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Don't know what effect us

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#7029



Cannot see which more benefit to 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:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Need a community hall in Long bay

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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

Do not support



#7029



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#7029



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have 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 want rates decrease, Auckland people already paid more than southern island. Also not agree with more rates and less services like reduce public bins, change rubbish collections to 2 weeks...this is insane.

**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



#7029



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?**

Fairly ok

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Long bay needs a community hall



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



**#7040**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7040



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#7040



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#7040



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#7040



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**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#7054



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#7054



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	Support



#7054



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#7054



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 less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less on activities that are not core council business.



**#7060**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

It's an old saying, but let's get Auckland moving. Cut out investment in nice to haves that may deliver some benefits and pander to a local minority. Focus on essentials that will improve traffic flow and deliver real benefits.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Minimising the time taken to complete road works that seem to go on forever.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

In your own words, stop previously-planned initiatives, such as some 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:

It's in a great location, close to public transport and the motorway. Current poor performance can be addressed by a more dynamic operational structure, and a willingness to see the stadium used for entertainment and other non-sporting activities.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#7060**



It makes good sense, and seems a sensible approach to funding future activities

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 have little confidence on POAL's plan to deliver more profits and dividends. A change in thinking is needed, and option 2 will meet that need.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Reliable Council services are what most ratepayers expect, in particular core services that maintain the appearance and functionality of the city.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Nothing to add

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 would love to see that area opened to the public. However, the cost will be astronomical, and the beneficiaries will be only those who visit it. I think Council's focus



#7060



must be on protecting and improving essential infrastructure. Having said that, I would like to re-visit the option in the future.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

I would love to see that area opened to the public. However, the cost will be astronomical, and the beneficiaries will be only those who visit it. I think Council's focus must be on protecting and improving essential infrastructure. Having said that, I would like to re-visit the option in the future.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#7060



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#7060



## 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 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



**#7060**



Spending on activities that are nice to have may feel good, but there are other priorities that I think the Board should focus on. I'm concerned to see a priority is to 'engage' on future use of reserves. I've lived in the area for over 10 years, and engagement has not produced a single change to reserves and open spaces where I live (Millwater). Prioritise action, not talking!

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

More action, less talk!

**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 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?



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?**



#7069



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#7069



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#7069



## 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	



#7069



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?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Wasted repetition of maintenance events. Such as a section on Whangaparāoa Road at Tindalls where there has been at least 6 or more times when it appears there’s some kind of drainage/burst water pipe issue that is a continual problem. The lane is



**#7074**



closed there sometimes for days while work is being done on this problem. It must be costing a fortune and what is the cost of doing a proper fix compared to the cost so far of getting the workers, equipment and impact on residents/traffic delays? Equally things like pothole fixes where the hole reappears not long after. out be a huge waste of money. So do less if these half-pie temporary fixes

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I live north of Auckland in Whangaparaoa and there seems to be more focus on central and south Auckland. Rail improvements are a great idea and I've used and enjoyed the fantastic rail network right across Sydney on my recent visits there. However there is no rail option north of the bridge in Auckland so it's irrelevant to me. The ferry service was excellent until it was culled drastically. Unexpected ferry cancellation are even sometimes replaced by taxis which must cost a fortune, let alone the emissions that must produce. Development in the Hibiscus Coast region has been increasing and as usual here (ie Auckland, if not nz in general) local infrastructure has not been developed to keep up with the increasing population. Penlink is a farce with the previous transport minister using his powers to push through a minimal two land toll-road with on-ramps. His decision should've been reversed when it was revealed he did not listen to advice/recommendations and misused his powers. So it appears to me that this region is being ignored or at least neglected but still further development is being allowed in this part of Auckland. There has to be more far-sighted long term planning for Auckland especially as it has the largest population and is the main economic hub of this country.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport and better roading. The lane expansion between Albany and around Wairau and putting in the northern expressway was a good idea. Public bus from Albany to the city is easy as there's a dedicated bus lane. But traffic after about Wairau builds up and often comes to a standstill as the lanes drop off and combined with the on-ramp the traffic has to merge and becomes very congested again. This even happens on a Sunday when you'd expect lighter traffic. There needs to be a dedicated busway between Albany and Silverdale and extra lanes through to Silverdale. Not just between Albany and the northern expressway..Wairau section. The congestion has just



**#7074**



been shunted along. Not actually addressed and yet again it's us North Aucklanders who have been neglected. Penlink will not fix this as there is still massive development up here.

## **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Not necessarily spend less but spend effectively by effective planning. Eg years ago there were road humps installed in Laurence St, Manly. They were the minimal kind and easy to navigate. This must've not done the job as central bollards were later installed between the lanes but had to be replaced twice as someone vandalized them and cut them down. Then the whole lot was removed and the minimal road humps replaced by massive lumps of road hump right across the whole road. Their design is so bad that even driving very slowly over them shocks the suspension. One of our cars tyres collapsed which must be due to the design of these humps as the car was in otherwise good condition. There are a number of humped roads just like these in Whangaparaoa peninsula including at least two other roads in Manly, the road to the Gulf Harbour marina/ferry terminal and in Shakespear park. This is a sign of poor road design or would speed cameras be more effective? This has flow on effects on emissions and vehicle maintenance. I don't object to road jumps where they are necessary but why are they designed so badly? In Australia eg Canberra there are road humps with a more streamlined design which aren't so damaging. They have also used road design to slow the traffic in some wider suburban lanes with clever use of traffic islands to slow fast traffic, essentially making a straight road more curved so slowing the traffic. Instead of raised pedestrian crossings how about installing pedestrian traffic lights. This would be safer on busy roads anyway as even with raised crossings cars don't always stop. Also with the huge humpy road humps here, some are painted to indicate the hump but this should be more reflective or fluorescent as they can be hard to see in certain lighting until you're right up close and have to suddenly brake or go over the hump and further destroy your suspension. So it's not simply to spend less but spend better.

Also with new housing developments plan the roads so they connect better to provide alternative routes or at least allow walking/bike paths through. There are a lot of roads here that end where another road also ends just past one or two houses where either their section layout could've been a bit more effectively designed or the roadmap looked at more closely for planners to notice they've blocked off access which would ease congestion. A lot of choke points are artificially created by having one road in-and-out and then having to merge into main roads and create even more congestion. The Silverdale on-off ramps, interchange and roundabout area is a classic example of terrible planning with housing intensification causing massive traffic congestion at peak times.



#7074



### 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:

Do not demolish the stadium. This would be very short sighted unless you plan to end housing intensification in this northern part of Auckland. Demolishing it now may save money “now” only for something like it to have to be rebuilt in future as there will be a growing future need for such a facility. You’re considering building a new stadium on the waterfront but demolishing an existing one?? Not everything has to be centralized around the city. That is one problem with Auckland and the small-town kind of thinking. It’s not a small town anymore and there needs to be more thinking around satellite townships that are more self sufficient. Yes, have some major events in Central areas but Auckland is expanding so needs the infrastructure to suit and enable that expansion to be successful. It should be a venue for all sorts of arts a, cultural and sporting events. What is a waste of an idea is to have a sports only stadium on the Auckland waterfront. Central Auckland should be a cultural/arts hub. Imagine a sports stadium in central Sydney?! Instead they have the opera house, botanic gardens and recently the fantastic “New Modern” art gallery. Even Sydney Darling Harbour is being redeveloped into a mixed use precinct. Not a sports stadium. Mixed use always brings in tourists and families which makes for a more vibrant and SAFER city. The existing stadiums in Auckland are enough and should be maintained and supported as such.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 statement that it would be managed by “a” professional fund manager(s) is not reassuring. Whatever rules and controls there are I’m not confident that a future fund will be managed will given Council and general public fund management history.

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Other

**Tell us here:**

Possibly option 2 as it appears to be the best option financially. However what are implications if it means council has no say in how the port operation is managed.

**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:**

Probably a mix as there are some underfunded council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This section has so much potential being so close to the city centre, public transport including ferries and tourism from cruise ships.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#7074



**Tell us why:**

As above. They could be turned into a mixed use area with parks and public spaces as well as provide a venue for festivals etc

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>



#7074



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Why are fees/rates increasing but services are being reduced. Eg rubbish recycling services seem to be reducing but rates haven't reduced. Have heard about the change to rubbish collection in Rodney and great that we won't have to privately but then also that council is intending to change rubbish collection from weekly to fortnightly and also that they have or intend to remove public rubbish bins in some areas. Are our rates being reduced to match this reduced service? Who's going to cover the cost of the likely increased illegal dumping? A lot of volunteers including myself do rubbish pickup already and what happens to that rubbish if they don't have a public rubbish bin to empty it into or have to wait a fortnight with the rubbish at home. Some of this rubbish is toxic, eg nappies and condims and I'm not going to want to volunteer picking up those things if I can't easily dispose of them safely. Encouraging people to do the right thing isn't always enough. Regarding public bins, in Australia they provide large wheelie bins (rubbish and recycling bins secured and restricted so they can't be opened too wide to avoid people dumping big items). Some towns there also have "smart" bins that can report when they're full and need rubbish emptied. That solves the problem of a rubbish truck unnecessarily collecting an empty rubbish bin. Why can't we be smart too and do this type of thing here? also with rubbish tags that thankfully doesn't affect my area, but why have a tag? Shouldn't rubbish collection be a public service as it always has been and isn't the use of tags adding to waste and emissions?



#7074



Regarding reintroducing recycling charges for schools. What message is this sending about the need to recycle? Schools are already underfunded so shouldn't be further burdened by more and increased charges. Kids will be encouraged to put more in rubbish bins and schools will be throwing out more "rubbish". There is already a lot of wastage in schools and they should be aided more in recycling and finding ways to reuse stuff.

The wqtr is vital in such a growing city with bad infrastructure. It should be an embarrassment that so many beaches are not even safe to swim at for a lot of the summer and after heavy rain.

## 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	Very Important



#7074



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.	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**

This is a growing area with lots of development and increased and changing population so all the above is very important to maintain the interests of the existing community and keep it thriving and connected as it grows

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Agree with the priorities.

Penlink is a big question mark as to whether it will solve congestion especially as development is still growing and the uncertain impact of the government's intensification policies without much forethought on the future infrastructure needs. The irony is the housing needs are partly artificial as migrant workers on temporary visas are brought in who also need housing and therefore creating a further need for increased developments and infrastructure. There seems to be little consideration on greenbelts or maintaining significant trees for instance where developers seem to be allowed to bulldoze the entire area freely. Developers are making enough money out of it so should be required to contribute to infrastructure and roaring and there should be a standard for green space/community gardens in new developments especially if the development is townhouses or apartments with no outdoor space. With the intensification there should be some requirement for neighbours to be notified and buildings shouldn't be allowed right up to the fence line as has been the case in some areas. These sorts of developments are going to be future ghettos made of poor



**#7074**



quality material and workmanship while the developer laps it up in their own luxury housing far from the eyesores that keep cropping up.

Part of the terrible congestion here is due to all the cars parked along roadsides. There should be some restrictions on at least main arterial routes to disallow cars parked on both sides of the road and not on blind corners. It's Russian roulette sometimes to pass a long row of cars and hope nothing is racing around the next bend and hope it's not a truck or bus. A lot of the parked cars are next to empty driveways so at least there should be a rule that if you have driveway space, park your car there. Alternatively allow cars to park up on verges if they don't restrict pathway access.

Also what is happening to the Gulf Harbour country club? Couldn't council put out a statement here and if the encumbrance/covenant is safe then say so which would save a lot of people's time and money, including for council? Could the land even be returned back to the community and turned into another nature park?

Public transport and traffic congestion is a big problem in Whangaparaoa. The ferry service being run down is appalling. There used to be an express bus in Whangaparaoa during peak morning and evening times but that was removed and now the ferry service reduced so forcing everyone back in their cars and therefore more road congestion. Combine this with the increasing assaults at bus interchanges and no one will be wanting to take public transport as it's becoming unsafe. What is being done to man the bus stations and even have security in busses themselves as bus drivers are also being threatened.

The 982 bus sometimes stops at Manly and sometimes goes through to Army Bay. If you miss the Army Bay bus it's sometimes an hour wait for the next one. Catching the interim 982 to Manly or the alternative 983 bus doesn't help if you live in Army Bay. It's either a very long walk or a very long wait at the bus terminal both being safety concerns and even worse at night especially for women and young people. So this part of Auckland is currently feeling very neglected.

#### **8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
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?

Fast public transportation within suburbs not between stations. Protected bike lanes

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7088**



Rubbish collection and flowers, gardening. I mean I agree with the council maintaining it but we don't need to plant pretty seasonal flowers and change it so often

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Would like to have it continued

stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roadworks

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

New viewpoint under pressure will eliminate the high cost of a possible bad administration expenditure

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#7088**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**

Climate impact of shipments needing to be transported into Auckland by truck or rail.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#7088



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#7088



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#7088



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**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

All good but would like to see a focus on nature. For example on new developments it would make sense to have Smaller homes with bigger backyards or apts blocks with big field areas and plenty of trees and protect the long bay -okura park.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please focus in make a city that is blended with it natural beauties. More trees, and green space. Concentrate in the ideas that make public transport out first option not because driving in traffic is terrible but because public transport is faster and more pleasant.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	
<b>Water</b>	
<b>City and local development</b>	
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



**#7091**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7091



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	
--	--



#7091



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



**#7091**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#7098

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

I do not need Food scrap waste collection--as I have adequate composting system.

I also only need monthly collection of landfill and recycling waste.



**#7098**



**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:**



#7098



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:**

use of these wharves could be for commercial purposes ,and generate income for the council.

**5b. What option do you prefer 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 15 year option must be kept in place--otherwise it may be another 15 years before it can be freed up.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment 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



#7098



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#7098



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?**

6a/6---pay as you throw rubbish collection is all I require , as a very low rubbish generator--only put out rubbish every one or two months--including recycling--it appears the council is fixated on large rubbish creators and penalising those who have already significantly reduced their wastage

**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	Very Important



#7098



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.	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?

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.



**#7103**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#7103**



Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#7103



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



**#7103**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Other

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#7103



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”



**#7103**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I agree with all the statements written but need to stress that northern Auckland needs greater input , eg better free parking facilities at hubs to increase public transport use,

Look into the possibility of using smaller buses to run more specific local routes, eg on Whangaparaoa Peninsula, an Orewa surrounds

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

It is the only stadium of its size on the northern side of Auckland, has great parking facilities, should be better utilised

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:

Why ditch a shareholding that is profitable with long term promise just for uncertain and likely short term gain



**#7109**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Sounds like a solid plan

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

There is a need for funding council services or there might not be any future!! However council services need to be streamlined and made more financially accountable

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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:**



#7109



Financial value of the lease

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#7109



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7110**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Previously planned initiatives like raised pedestrian crossings should not be shelved. Public safety in our urban environment is a priority. Planned cycle ways that support a reduction in urban congestion, increase safety and support a reduction in carbon emissions should not be shelved either.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

What does network optimisation mean?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

We should keep this public asset. Once it has gone the North Shore would not have a stadium which is shorted sighted in view of the growth of the North Shore. Undertake an investigation into why the current management and systems of use to explain why it is under-utilised and develop a utilisation plan accordingly.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:



**#7110**



This once again undermines Auckland's previous investment Auckland Airport which is a strategic asset for both Auckland and New Zealand. Airport shares have already been sold in the last ACC budget round. With increased air travel predicted, why would the shares be sold to support a proposal like the Auckland Future Fund that doesn't even exist.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Tinkering with the port land and ownership would erode control over this strategic asset. A well functioning port is essential for support following major natural disasters where motorways, motorway bridges, roads, the Harbour Bridge and rail may be disrupted/destroyed.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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's better to use the money to support current council services. How long would it take for the AFF to actually provide any dividends/money for Auckland?

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The Auckland Future Fund is unlikely to generate that much revenue especially as New Zealand is currently in a recession.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#7110



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Why would the ACC develop an area that under current climate change predictions would be marginal or unsustainable for use? This is not where ACC money should be used.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

See 5a

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#7110



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#7110



## 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
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



**#7110**



These priorities meet my expectations on how our community and environment should be managed.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It supports the community and environment and also ensure mana whenua is consulted.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Please bring back the rubbish bins at local parks and beaches. In fact provide more with better recycle options.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7118**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Nobody wants or uses the cycle ways and walkways. Please stop wasting money on them. I spent 4 days in the city a month ago and I saw a total of 2 bikes in the cycle lanes. Waste of resource better spent elsewhere. Auckland just isn't suitable for cycling!! Plus only the city centre benefits yet the rest of Auckland pays for them!

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Water transport - ferries. We have an entire ocean to make use off. Electric ferries are reliable and good for the environment. There would be more access to places further out via Ferry. Also improving popular travel routes. The new northern motorway through dome Valley is life changing!! Do more if this please!!

### 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:

Only if this means more concerts and events can be hosted here. North Auckland pays some of the largest bills yet we get the least amount of resources. Having a venue for events and concerts in our side of the bridge for once would be amazing.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



**#7118**



**Tell us why:**

It makes sense and is good business.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#7118



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere 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



#7118



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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	Not Important
--	---------------



#7118



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?**

I feel like these are not aligned with the priorities of the rate payers.

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#7118



**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.	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.	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?**



**#7118**



L

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Omaha

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	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.



**#7120**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

N/a

**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:**



**#7120**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#7120



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#7120



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#7120



## 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.	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.	
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



**#7120**



Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Surf lifesaving clubs stand as bastions of safety along our coastlines, providing essential services that ensure the well-being of beachgoers. However, the infrastructure of many of these clubs is showing signs of wear and tear, reaching the end of their operational lives. Without swift intervention and adequate funding, the ability of these clubs to continue their vital work will be severely compromised.



**#7121**



· The risk of losing volunteers due to inadequate facilities looms over Auckland. This poses a dire threat to the uninterrupted vigilance that has safeguarded our beaches for over a century.

· To address this pressing issue, we implore Auckland Council to allocate \$8.02 million within the Long Term Plan. This funding should be specifically earmarked for the reconstruction and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, in alignment with the comprehensive Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal put forth by Surf Lifesaving Northern Region.

· Consider, for instance, the case of Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club. For seven decades, this institution has stood as a pillar of safety and community service. Currently, its membership includes approximately 150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf participants aged 6 to 14, and an additional 600 associate members. However, the club's current infrastructure, having surpassed its useful life, can no longer adequately accommodate its members and activities. A new building is not merely desirable but imperative to ensure the continued provision of lifesaving services to both its membership and the broader community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Be more efficient at delivering fit for purpose solutions. There is a great deal of wastage / unnecessary spend due to inefficient processes and bad business practices. Get your ship in order before asking for more money from taxpayers.

Streamline processes and eliminate duplication and unnecessary activities that lead to excessive costs across all of your projects.

**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?**



**#7121**



**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



#7121



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#7121



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Regarding Question 1c, Auckland Council proposes prioritizing spending in areas of critical need. Surf Life Saving facilities play a pivotal role in our community, serving as temporary welfare and community centers, as well as civil defense hubs during emergencies like the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. During such crises, volunteers from Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club rescued over 70 individuals while operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities are not merely optional; they are the lifeblood of our service. Securing allocated funding is imperative to ensure the ongoing operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The requested amount is modest compared to the immense regional benefit it would yield.

**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?**



#7121



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.	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**

Finalizing the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the redevelopment of the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club are crucial priorities for the upcoming year. This ensures community well-being, enhances safety services, promotes environmental sustainability, fosters community engagement, and facilitates long-term planning and resource allocation

prioritizing the completion of the review of the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the redevelopment of the Surf Lifesaving Club is not just about ticking off tasks; it's about investing in the safety, well-being, and sustainability of the community for years to come.



**#7121**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

The proposed priorities outlined for the 10-year budget 2024-2034 by Hibiscus and Bays, particularly regarding the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan, warrant thorough consideration and support. Emphasizing the delivery of the outlined outcomes within this timeframe holds significant merit for several reasons:

**Community Well-being:** The Mairangi Bay Reserve serves as a vital recreational space and community hub. Fulfilling the objectives of the management plan, including the construction of a new surf lifesaving club building and associated facilities, contributes to enhancing community well-being by providing safe and modern amenities for residents and visitors alike.

**Safety and Emergency Preparedness:** The provision of a new surf lifesaving club building is crucial for bolstering beach safety measures and emergency response capabilities. Upgrading facilities and ensuring adequate storage for lifesaving equipment can enhance the effectiveness of lifesaving operations, ultimately saving lives and safeguarding beachgoers.

**Infrastructure Maintenance:** Addressing road closure and seawall maintenance as outlined in the plan is essential for preserving the integrity of critical infrastructure within the reserve. Proactive maintenance measures can mitigate risks associated with erosion, deterioration, and access issues, ensuring the long-term sustainability of the area.

**Environmental Conservation:** Effective management of the Mairangi Bay Reserve involves considering environmental sustainability. Measures such as seawall maintenance should be undertaken with careful consideration of ecological impacts, aiming to minimize disruption to coastal ecosystems and preserve natural habitats.

**Community Engagement and Satisfaction:** Prioritizing the implementation of the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan demonstrates a commitment to meeting the needs and expectations of the local community. By delivering on proposed outcomes, authorities can enhance community satisfaction and foster a sense of ownership and pride in the reserve.

Overall, prioritizing the delivery of Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the specified timeframe aligns with broader objectives of promoting community well-being, safety, environmental sustainability, and community engagement. It represents a proactive approach to enhancing the quality of life for residents and



**#7121**



visitors while preserving the natural beauty and integrity of the reserve for future generations

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

Support local surf lifesaving clubs and beach facilities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7127**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

public transport is good

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

funding for public transportation and bike lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Seems a waste of space and facilities as currently used - develop better use or redevelop as other sports/ local community shared resources

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#7127



Tell us here:

I have no idea

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	Support
---	---------



#7127



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#7127



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Fairly Important



#7127



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?**

Support funding for new Mairangi Bay surf club building and development of beaches/park space in general. Specifically would like to see new club house.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#7129**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

It makes sense. Auckland has to keep moving forward in improving public transport, the CBD, suburbs, waterways, parks and forests, and the whole overall environment.

### 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, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

It needs improving as is, and it needs to keep moving forward in ensuring that there is ongoing improvements to the stadium itself, its facilities and surrounding community fields, and the usage needs. There's no point putting more good money into an old stadium. Ensuring that the best use of the stadium and community playing fields, are maintained and improved upon, is in the best interests of the whole community. It makes sense to sell land that is not essential to the smooth running of the stadium and community playing fields. This is more than likely best incorporated with changes to the operational management 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)?

Other

### Tell us why:



**#7129**



Why can't an Auckland Future Fund be established, with or without the transfer of AIAL shares?

Are rates and other income for the ACC not already held in some sort of interest bearing account or fund? If not, it should be, which seems to make sense in establishing an AFF.

I feel nervous about enabling the subsequent sale of any or all the shares in AIAL (by a fund manager or the Council); do we end up with the airport and/or Auckland city being owned or managed by overseas establishments, or wealthy individuals here and abroad, making profits at the expense of the individual residents and citizens that make up the communities of Auckland City, and the whole of Aotearoa New Zealand.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Whatever is best and avoids any overseas or international take-over or overall management/lease of the PoA, which would take it out of the control of the ACC, Aucklanders and all New Zealanders.

**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:**

Can it not continue to be used to fund council services and be invested in the proposed Auckland Future Fund, or am I confused that the Auckland Future Fund won't fund council services?

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



**#7129**



Please do not allow the airport or the port to be sold off, or for them to be 100% managed/leased/run, by wealthy individuals, businesses and organizations, especially those from overseas. It's important that Auckland City, and NZ as a whole, does not lose it's control over how the profits are spent/invested - with the risk of profits going off-shore - and that Auckland City and the whole country, does not become owned, managed or run by international or NZ-based individuals, businesses, organizations and/or other countries, for their own profit only.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer, at least, the Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to the Council for the future benefit of the public, as long as there is not an increase in shipments being transported into Auckland by truck, and only by rail if the railway network is improved - which it should be. We have far too many trucks transporting shipments/goods on our NZ roads as it is. As to the Bledisloe Terminal, please proceed with caution as mentioned previously, and don't do anything with it that takes profits out of the coffers of the ACC, and is not beneficial to Aucklanders and New Zealanders.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Whatever is done with the Bledisloe Terminal, please proceed with caution as mentioned previously, and don't do anything with it that takes profits out of the coffers of the ACC, and/or does not benefit Aucklanders or New Zealanders, or New Zealand as a country. Would it be best to sort the two wharves out first, keeping the terminal as a PoA operational area until reassessing, following the outcome of whatever is considered best to do with the two wharves.



#7129



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#7129



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#7129



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**

I believe that the number one, urgent and important priority is the provision of more support, advocacy and action being taken in improving the protection of our sea, soil and fresh water (from sewage, other contamination and sedimentation) through improvements to our waterways, including methods such as re-naturalization and daylighting, for the Hibiscus and Bays area.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Keep making improvements, with the improvement to our waterways in eradicating sewage and other contamination to any supply of water within the area (and for all of the country) being the number one priority.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

reopening closed walkways due to track work and kauri dieback.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less transport safety initiatives, less underused cycle lanes.



**#7134**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making buses work better is a good investment.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

space for scooters and cycles on very heavily utilised urban routes.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Please stop wasting money on annoying traffic safety measures and just trust people to look when crossing roads.

**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 work for concerts too. Just not used enough in its current incarnation.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Sounds like a pragmatic proposal that will give council more options.



**#7134**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 land is important, the port can be run as a private enterprise and compete with the other 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?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:**



#7134



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#7134



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#7134



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**

This is a really poor set of priorities that tell me nothing. Is all you are doing supporting and advocating? Shouldn't we actually do something?

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

The plan is to advocate to other groups, the issues seem fair but I'd really like to see some things they could achieve on their own. There seems to be plenty of money being spent what are they doing with this? This part of the plan seems like a rush job compared to other local boards and the rest of the plan.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No , the council should look at reducing cost and doing more.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7139**



Transport. 500k for a pedestrian crossing from AT is a joke. Instead of fixing flood issues , council should discourage building housed on flood zone. Let business take lead on the urban regeneration so that council can take a planning role rather than banking/financing role.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

500k for a pedestrian crossing from AT is a joke. We need to fix AT before spending money on Auckland transport

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

spend money to reduce public transport fares , not wasting more money and increase public transport fare every year. How about remove all AT marketing team and cost and subsidize these saving in public transport fares

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

spend less on pedestrian crossing , AT Metro marketing and IT system.

## **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



**#7139**



**Tell us why:**

Auckland council should stop adding new thing or taking new initiative , please focus on your core business serving Auckland people. Spend money on having enough rubbish bins and empty the bins every week. Stop doing new thing when you can't even afford the basics.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 your gold goose.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Please reinstate all the rubbish bins you removed and Spend money on having enough rubbish bins and empty the bins every week. Stop doing new thing when you can't even afford the basics.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#7139



Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#7139



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	
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?

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.



**#7145**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#7145**



Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.



#7145



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



**#7145**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#7152**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#7152**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#7152



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



**#7152**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#7155**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#7155**



Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#7155



<p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p>	



**#7155**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#7156**



## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

1. You killed light rail and need to replace it with something 2. Subsidise bus and train fares more to reduce car use. 3. Build another bridge parallel to the existing harbour bridge for buses, walkers, cyclists capable of taking light rail in the future.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

See above

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Keep the land and stadium for future public 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:**

Keep ALL our ownership of AIAL don't make it easier for future sell offs.

## **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Other

**Tell us here:**

Lease the operation but use the \$\$ to fund a new bridge or other major transport infrastructure. Do not fritter it away on holding rates down.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Could be used for cruise ships, public space etc.

may need a dolphin mooring

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Too much strain on transport into Auckland from other ports



#7156



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#7156



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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



#7156



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**

**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 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, concentrate on basic services

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7161**



Stop spending money on community festivals or events. Get sponsorship from business to cover these.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

These services should be provided by central government, not regional councils

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Maintaining an acceptable standard in walkways. The amount of walkways that do not get mowed or weeds removed is shocking. The North Shore never had this problem when we had our own council.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Public events, this is not the councils responsibility

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

The resource is under utilised, question whoever that manages this currently has the skillset in this 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



**#7161**



**Tell us why:**

Sell the shares to pay off debt.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell the port, pay off debt

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

none

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#7161



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#7161



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

none

## 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
--	---------------



#7161



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?**

none



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Tennis Northern

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?

Council need to stop focusing on raising more funds and get back to the core role and cut the cost blowouts that have been caused by using too many consultants too often and too many third parties such as lawyers.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7163**



Do less of the non essential such as music in parks and all of the nice to have but are not needed.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It makes sense.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

The core services.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The nice to have.

**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 easily be altered to become an 8,000 to 10,000 facility which would then be able to be used by community sport.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#7163**



Council are hugely in debt it makes sense to sell non essential assets that are not strategic.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#7163



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#7163



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	----------------



#7163



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**

**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	Very Important
---	----------------



#7163



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.	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.	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**



#7163



Rodney

## 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.	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.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#7163**



**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?**

If we can't afford it don't build 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?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	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.



**#7173**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

You will be able to find cost savings by reducing inefficiencies. If the various departments communicated better then projects would be done correctly the first time. For example, in recent years I've seen great cycle lanes being developed, then dug up, then done again, then dug up again.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support investment in public transport. I agree Council should stop wasting money on things like raised pedestrian crossings.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**



**#7173**



**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 key objectives are all very important. Owning 11% of the airport is not important.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 is a smart way to release capital. It's not crucial that Council owns things. It is crucial that Council achieves the key objectives.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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?**



#7173



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	Support



#7173



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.



#7173



Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

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



#7173



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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:**

Building an efficient public transport system is essential to getting the city moving. Not only is the slow peak hour traffic frustrating for motorists but it also increases the greenhouse gases being emitted.

**2a. Is there anything you 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 northern part of the city is developing rapidly so a good stadium is needed. The fact that the current management has been inefficient isn't reason to remove the stadium. Neither is a lack of funds a reason for such a short sighted idea.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

This appears to be short sighted.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#7174**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Most bigger cities do not have their wharves in the middle of the city. Unloading and storing cars is not a sensible use of valuable land and the number of vehicles moving to and from the wharves is a problem for the roads - congestion, wear and tear, time o travel

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#7174



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#7174



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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
---	------------------



#7174



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
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 support for the arts on the Hibiscus Coast have not had been changed since the super city was formed and is very much lower than other local boards. The area is also growing more rapidly so needs funding in keeping with its population.

Centrestage Theatre in Orewa is owned by a Trust and needs continued support from the Council to keep providing an up to date theatre that serves the whole community. Without a good level of support, the theatre could become insolvent and the Council would have to the over the running of it which would be very much more expensive than funding it as much of the work is done by volunteers.

**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?

<b>Transport</b>	Do less
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More users pays systems - ie congestion charging, rail network, Paywave, parking, rubbish collection, librarys, swimming pool, North Shore Stadium etc.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7178**



CRL Rail network which is causing the massive increase in rate in year three should be changed to more of a user pays system. People who can't use the services shouldn't have to subsidise them.

Slash cone management - make the people having the work done pay for the cone service.

Don't worry about transport emissions targets for the next couple of year - put it off for now.

Collect rubbish every two weeks.

Don't put back the bins you've removed ... people will stop complaining soon and figure out if the walk another minute they'll find a bin ... and if not ...take it home

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Agree with the cutting spending on low value initiatives that cost too much

Agree with other initiatives as long as they proceed with a user pays objective.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

CRL Rail network which is causing the massive increase in rate in year three should be changed to more of a user pays system. People who can't use the services shouldn't have to subsidise them.

Slash cone management - make the people having the work done pay for the cone service.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other



**#7178**



**Tell us why:**

A white elephant is always a white elephant. However - a strawberry pick your own farm in Auckland recently discovered turning its facilities into a water park is very popular and very profitable ... We need something new, big and bold that will attract locals and tourist ...

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

History tells us these are good ideas that work

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Whichever gives the best ROI at the end of day but I suspect leasing to a business to run it efficiency would be best

**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:**



#7178



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Expensive and ugly car park

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support



#7178



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#7178



## 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 other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important



#7178



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**

We need to drive on the shore ... other options are not viable.

**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:**

The port of Auckland need to stay in the hands of Auckland city not in the hand of overseas central

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#7181



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#7181



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#7181**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do 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?



**#7186**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#7186



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#7186



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#7186



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	Not Important



#7186



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	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Get everyone to pay for their rubbish collection not just north shore.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7187**



Reduce the number of people working at the council. Are you operating leanly and effectively.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

10 years is too long, we need a solution to connect northern auckland to the city in addition to the bridge.

### **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?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

If you can sell some land to build a more effective and cost effective stadium that makes sense.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### **Tell us why:**



**#7187**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:**



#7187



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#7187



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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



#7187



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?

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	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 sports facilities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7195**



Don't sell assets

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to keep people moving

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

We can't lose sports assets the region is growing we in fact need better facilities

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

No enough details

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



**#7195**



**Tell us here:**

Not enough clear details

**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:**

More details required

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?**



#7195



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#7195



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Fairly Important



#7195



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.	Fairly 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**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



**#7197**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7197



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#7197



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



**#7197**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#7201**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#7201



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.



#7201



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



#7201



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

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



#7201



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**

Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”



**#7201**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Our fields and playgrounds maintained to standard for our kids and their sports.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7218**



Do less of artwork and sculptures around the community that cost a fortune when there are other ways costing 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, Other

**Tell us why:**

Make a smaller stadium for community groups to use, reduce costs and gets opportunity for community groups to use

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

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?**



**#7218**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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



#7218



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#7218



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	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	Very Important



#7218



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.	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.	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**

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	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	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?



**#7253**



**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, 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:**



#7253



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
---	---------------------



#7253



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#7253



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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



#7253



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?

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 less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport including reliable train and ferry services. More parking on public transport hubs. Think big picture and future thinking and borrow against infrastructure being built and don't borrow money for nice townhaves and pretty designs...

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#7274**



Less feasibility studies that are being shelved as a result of budget restraint.

Use ability from staff on the ground to investigate and make better decisions and not high level decisions by governing body that have huge impact on community but not achieving much in result of giving back or saving money, re bin removal.

## **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?**

Free Parking on transport hubs

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bike lanes

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

The model worked before unnecessary money was spent. Use as sports and multi purpose event centre and overall sport and other event.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#7274**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:**



#7274



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#7274



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

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 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



#7274



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?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all 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	Very Important



#7274



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#7274**



**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 more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Yes A proper rail Service for public an commercial services for goods landed by sea , as well as wood supply trains an other commodities, Get a lot of trucks off the roads thereby reduce expenditure on upkeep { u"ll save billions }in the long run



**#7276**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

By doing logical long term beneficial projects then in future council will do less an the public will end up paying less not like currently when we are literally throwing \$\$\$\$ on everything that is broken like example Kiwi Rail ,our transport network an allowing these little residential developments to happen on outskirts of Auckland without a thought how those people are going to get to work never mind the old infrastructure to handle everything

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

simply put u got a barrier removal on Auckland bridge this needs to be extended all the way to tristan glenfield opening up more lanes in thereby reducing congestion further in the mornings an evenings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

definitely consider a new 6 lane bridge build now for benefit of tomorrow tunnelling is too expensive ( toll it an increase licence fees rucs by a few cents every yr an make sure there's a rail line going over to all the way up north an then underground to ports )

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no as we need to plan for future generations just because everything gone up an up we will have good times again just imagine 15 yrs from now fast reliable trains free flowing traffic 24hrs No Pot HOLES

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**



**#7276**



Because it totally not managed properly its in a great area ,we need more events happening there ,more concerts ,more rugby games more international 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:**

short term benefit for long term gain

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 the ports can't expand ,cause there is no rail connection like most other ports around the world, the whole rail network been neglected for decades now we paying the price for that ,lease an get some \$\$\$ before there's nothing or upgrade some grandiose scheme including rail an be surprised Yes it will cost billions yes most cry foul but when its all done the revenue gained for future use will be mind-blowing world class some might say

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 up or down



#7276



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

already said before

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

UHMMMM a rail crossing onto Bledsoe wharf now that's a game changer an the other 2 extend them for cruise ships

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

as above previous question

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#7276



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#7276



regarding water quality ensure all new builds have to have filter system inbuilt thus ruling out contamination, do not support charges for schools ,an rates funded refuse as all these increases every yr instead get several tender for these services to public

## 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.	I don't know



#7276



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 reserves need to be kept for everyone to be enjoyed

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

100% support it although more can be done we need more places for our kids/teenages to go an feel safe to socialise like gaming rooms or internet kiosks or other forms of entertainment engage with these kids an find out what they want

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no just remember every thing considered to day can change the the future to be a better place



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Provide specific dog parks and dog beaches around the local area so dog walkers have more options in the summer months to walk their dogs in specific areas. Building of a new surf club or a super club that multiple water sports can work out. The surf club provides families of the Mairangi Bay Area and wider community a sense of family



**#7292**



through sport and teaching life long skills of water safety, first aid managing by safety scenarios.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Extra rubbish trucks which pickup the compost bins.

**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?**

Pen link and expanding motorways to reduce afternoon traffic when travelling out of Auckland.

**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:**

Ensure greater use by 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:**



**#7292**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?**



#7292



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#7292



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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



#7292



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?**

Building of a new surf club or a super club that multiple water sports can work out. The surf club provides families of the Mairangi Bay Area and wider community a sense of family through sport and teaching life long skills of water safety, first aid managing by safety scenarios.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



**#7297**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

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:**



**#7297**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:**



#7297



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#7297



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



#7297



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 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



**#7297**



### **Tell us why**

“Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.”

### **7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

“It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.”

### **8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

not collect food scraps



**#7301**



**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?**

Walking and cycling paths

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is the only stadium asset in north Auckland, with the new north west connection complete it is easily accessed by north and west Auckland and with good management should be able to make this work.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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



#7301



Tell us 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



#7301



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#7301



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	Fairly Important



#7301



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?**