



Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

(10-year budget)

Written Feedback

Hibiscus and Bays Volume #3

April 2024



Sub #	Organisation Name	Page Number
8266	Queer coasties	526



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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 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?



#7304



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#7304



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7304



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



#7304



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and 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.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	Not Important



#7304



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

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

education

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



#7309



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:



#7309



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Other

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7309



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



#7309



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

We are already paying extra for some climate issues, yet the council seems to allow mass denuding of mature trees effecting the environment and nature, removing bins from beachside areas while saying they were less used bins was untrue, places like



#7318



Whangaparaoa where water ways wash into the sea, has meant there is now more plastic and trash lying around...how hard is it to enforce developers to not strip every green space and cram as many roofs onto green land, and not have some oversight around mature trees, and the right to shade, children having green space and the rights of birds bees and insects to survive.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

make eftpos, instant pay available on buses, instead of plastic bus passes for people who seldom use buses.

Keep all the weeds cleared along edges of footpaths, they become well entrenched and then effect the footpaths, next we will be paying for repairs replaced footpaths. Forget cycle paths/lanes unless there is a clear reason that has more than a few people using them.

Keep up with increased volume of traffic management with dynamic lanes changing times, Silverdale/Whangaparaoa entrance system needs changing earlier, how long has it been left to whats been used now.

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

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

Not everybody from outlying suburbs benefit in anyway from all the cash spent on city inner, trains.

Why run the large buses outside commute times, half of them travel around over half empty, surely there is a few smaller fleet also available, less weight on roads less running cost.

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

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



#7318



Tell us why:

should be utilised more, smaller concert venue, cultural events

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

If growth of our airport means higher use is there a future prospect f higher returns, instead of share holders then holding their hands out for more dividends.

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

dont know both sound feasible, but once again, selling off assets how often does the money get lost 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:

Auckland as a whole counts not just inner city, we already see lack of upkeep of basic infrastructure

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

Tell us here:



#7318



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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7318



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

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

Dont give lip service to protecting whats left of the environment and green space.

Many people dont put rubbish out weekly so how does that extra cost effect them.

Why are people with water tanks who are more conservative with water use charged such a high rate for waste water, less water use, less waste water, most large families have already connected, and smaller households still retain water tanks.



#7318



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus 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.	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	Very Important



#7318



road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Tell us why

leave whats left of greens spaces protected, stop the loss of the Gulf Harbour last green space, with so much infill housing already taken over the area, HBC cant sustain more people, its a small area, surrounded by the ocean, already gets inundated with visitors over summer, stripping Okoromai bay of shell fish, and leaving overflowing bins and trash everywhere, a group of dedicated dogs walkers spend more time picking up peoples rubbish, including the whipper snipper plastic off cuts left by council workers ! Special areas should be protected.

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

Dont know. Dont have much faith in Councils anymore.

Walking around out local areas, state of footpaths, loss of mature trees, rubbish,

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Public transport

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

Cultural events and parades like pride



#7351



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?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it as its not used

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#7351



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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



#7351



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



#7351



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



#7351



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	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 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.



#7354



- 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)?



#7354



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.



#7354



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#7354



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

6b. Do you have 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



#7354



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	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?



#7387



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:

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



#7387



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7387



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

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



#7387



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Fairly Important



#7387



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?

Pubic transport links need to be improved for the Whangaparaoa/Silverdale area and it should be forward thinking. Penlink should be 2 lanes each way instead of everything being 20 years behind the times and needs of a growing, family based 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	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.



#7396



- 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 the woke brigade from setting up ridiculous rubbish collection initiatives, raised crossings and trying to make the city "liveable" for people who don't even live here

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?

Surf clubs at Takapuna, Mairangi Bay and Browns Bay!

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

Food scrap collection

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



#7396



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:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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



#7396



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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7396



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

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

- 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



#7396



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.	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



#7396



Continue to support activities 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

· With regard to Question 7b, answer as you wish and include the following in 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.”

· With regard to Question 7c:

“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?

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.



#7402



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

Tell us why:

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



#7402



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



#7402



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



#7402



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

6b. Do you have 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



#7402



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

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.



#7402



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#7411



- 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)?



#7411



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



#7411



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



#7411



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

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

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

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

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our

Very Important



#7411



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

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.



#7411



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

build up public transport. And make it safer for teens to use, as they afraid using it right now. Also make it a safer environment for bus drivers to.

Youth work/and clubs. They bored and need a place to get together.



#7416



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

less Local board Xmas parades perhaps. One in Akl will do. Or get Business Assoc. to run events rather than LB. So the budget can be used for youth work.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

yes we need an Airport service. Currently my visitor been stranded at the airport. Shuttle was full three times in a row, they took the bus to Onehunga train station, which was closed. Leaving a 21-year-old stranded at night in Onehunga. Reinstate the AT Airport bus to town!!

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

more cycle lanes less cars on the road. Cycling is not safe in Akl, especially for kids to get to school. If school kids could safely get from and to school, less parents will drive them.

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

more motorways as proposed by Government.

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

perhaps a private Investor can run the main stadium, while the fields should be used by local clubs. So break this up in two and get the LB to manage the fields via Community. And the main stadium to be privately managed.



#7416



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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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



#7416

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7416



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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



#7416



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

so kids can go by bike to school, Im missing youth work funding here!

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

not much in it than advocate stuff. Where is Youth work?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#7417



- 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)?



#7417



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



#7417



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



#7417



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

6b. Do you have 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?



#7417



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

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.



#7417



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

No

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

No



#7419



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:

Council should not be in stadia.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#7419



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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



#7419



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



#7419



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



#7419



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?

1b. 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.



#7454



- 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)?



#7454



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	
---	--



#7454



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



#7454



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

6b. Do you have 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	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?

Why such a biased question as increased productivity can do more eg T2 lanes can be used for trucks T3 lanes become T2 lanes for use by buses and trucks as well

Bus lanes become T2 lanes and for trucks as well



#7509



Water in and out and truck-bus-car transport need to be improved -everything else needs to be stopped or bare maintenance only

Use much higher dog fees for inspection & dog rangers as Hibiscus beaches are no go zones for toddlers and elderly

Use event funding and reduced days eg Wed to Sunday for venues and libraries & 20% less staff to keep beaches clean and with community involvement prevent coastal erosion where erosion is affecting reserves and water quality

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

Since amalgamation staff numbers are up 20% and staff costs up 30%- what about less meetings less reports and increased productivity

No more speed bumps

Watercare and AT come under council control

No event funding for any local events including Pacifica Diwali Lantern Festival and Gay Parade -only consider major events such as FIFA Cup

No more money on Central City-we are a collection of villages who don't relate to inner city or work there or want to shop or visit

Less trucks collecting different rubbish-including garden waste we have 4 different trucks down our street

Only 1 wide (house boundary to kerb) path per street for walking and cycling

Stop resealing already ok roads such as my local road Marellan Red Beach

No sister city activity

Use golf courses for storm water using lakes

Create adopt a reserve or beach using local schools, service clubs, iwi to improve facilities through funding and regular cleanup

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:



#7509



T3 and bus lanes become T2 lanes used by T2 buses and trucks

No more bike lanes or speed humps

Synchronise traffic lights to suit T 2 lanes especially buses

No more lights-use roundabouts

1 very wide path per street for cycling and walking

Use pavers for easier digging up

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

T2 lanes for buses trucks and T2 lanes

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

Speed humps cycle ways

Paving adequate roads

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It used to be popular and a vast area north of the bridge needs a stadium as we don't want to go south over the bridge and it's easy accessed by west 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:

Diversify huge risk for port and airport and lift productivity and safety of port



#7509



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

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

Tell us here:

Port is unsafe and slow and a huge risk-make money by leasing

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Money is usually frittered away

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

Tell us here:

It should be a high growth fund

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

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

Tell us why:

Jewel in Auckland's crown and could be base for ferries and 2 nd harbour crossing

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



#7509



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

Tell us why:

Better use and more income and safer

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7509



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

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

Significantly raise dog fees and a lot more for 2 dog homes and no 3 or more dog homes-all subject to yearly inspection

Charge other animals eg hens and ducks in residential areas

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7509



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

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	Not Important

Tell us why

Protect beaches and keep clean as well as parks using adopt a beach by schools etc

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

Focus on T2 lanes for buses trucks and T2 cars including Penlink



#7509



No community events

Retain bins and improve facilities

8. Do you have any other comments?

Productivity and staff reduction id number 1 - costs are up 20 to 30 per cent since amalgamation with a reduction in services outside city centre

Transport by bus truck and car are paramount



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

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.



#7518



- 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)?



#7518



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.



#7518



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#7518



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

6b. Do you have 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.

d. Answer Question 7a (OPTIONAL) with regard to funding priorities Mairangi Bay SLSC's local board area. Choose Hibiscus and Local Bays Local Board.

· With regard to Question 7b, answer as you wish and include the following in 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."

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

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

Specific funding/ budget allocation needs to be set aside for surf lifesaving facilities across the Auckland region including club redevelopment. Without that funding the council has too much opportunity to decline and further decline and further delay redevelopment projects that have been in discussion for decades.

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



#7537



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:



#7537



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

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

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



#7537



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

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

The hibiscus and bays local board must prioritize the finalization of the review of the 2015 reverse management plan so that any development project can proceed unimpeded.

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays



#7537



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.	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.	Not Important

Tell us why



#7537



The hibiscus and bays local board must prioritize the finalization of the review of the 2015 reverse management plan so that any development project can proceed unimpeded.

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

Mairangi bay surf club is a huge community and needs the club house to be redeveloped.

:)



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	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?

Acquisition of a regional park for the existing and newly developing southern area

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



#7582



Less operating divisions in the Council management sometimes with an apparent silo approach and lack of connection with what actually is needed.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Most of these proposals are worthwhile. More sensible traffic management around minor works often with extremely minimal risk to workers or the public. Currently the traffic management must massively inflate the costs of very minor work.

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

Greenways and walking connections through suburbs and between parks.

More planting of grassed areas to reduce maintenance cost and global warming gas emissions.

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:

To more effectively promote the use of this valuable facility. Some enhancement of the area could be considered

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



#7582



Tell us why:

If this fund was established it must be ring fenced so that it does not become just a convenient slush fund and is used for capital improvements and no assets are alienated from public ownership

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

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

Tell us here:

Important to retain full control of such a critical connection with the flow of goods and services.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Important to maintain funding services unless other funding such as the GST spent in Auckland available or a Fuel Tax

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:



#7582



These areas could be needed for port operations 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:

Cannot see that it will not be needed for the port operations

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7582



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

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

Believe degree of user pays should apply to household waste collection.

Inorganic collections are badly done and items useful for reuse and repurposing are destroyed by the manner in which they are collected.

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

There needs to be a process for developing a ring fence fund for the acquisition of further regional parks for the new areas of Auckland. These parks are vital for the type



#7582



of informal recreation the majority of people undertake and have proven mental and physical health benefits. Central government should be lobbied to support due to the absent of large National Parks near Auckland and the saving in the operation of the health services that would be made.

The health benefits of green spaces

Publish Date : 01 May 2019

- [ENVIRONMENT](#)
- [GREEN SPACES](#)
- [MAYOR](#)
- [PARKS / OUTDOORS](#)



An increasing body of evidence suggests that a closer connection to nature is good for our heads, our hearts and our lungs. But as Auckland grows, our precious green spaces and trees are increasingly under threat. In the first part of a three-part series for OurAuckland, Elly Strang looks at the many benefits green spaces bring to the health of our people and our city.

Humans have long believed that being in or around nature has healing properties. But the idea was previously more intuitive than evidential – a warm glow rather than hard science. Now, with large-scale public-health problems such as obesity and depression being linked to a rise in technology, a disconnect from the outdoors and more time spent inside, researchers are showing renewed interest in the topic, and studies from around the world are finding that those who live close to green spaces enjoy positive impacts on both their physical and mental wellbeing.

The science behind green wellbeing

A new Danish study has found that when children grow up with green space around them, they have 55 per cent less risk of developing a range of mental-health problems later in life. Researchers from Aarhus University found that the more greenery a person is exposed to up to the age of 10, the lower the risk of 16 mental

disorders, including anxiety and depression, even when controlling for factors such as socio-economics and urbanisation.

“Our findings affirm that integrating natural environments into urban planning is a promising approach to improve mental health and reduce the rising global burden of psychiatric disorders,” the study’s authors say.

Closer to home, a team led by University of Canterbury professor Simon Kingham has studied the effects of public and private green spaces on physical health. The research analysed the activities of 12,500 New Zealanders, including 2500 Aucklanders, and found they were less likely to be overweight or suffer from obesity if they lived close to a park.

“Globally, nearly every study I’ve read says the more green space you’ve got near where you live, the better your health is,” Kingham says. “Park creation and planting in existing public spaces may serve as low-cost disease prevention options.”

In its 10-year budget released last year, Auckland Council boosted funding for parks, open spaces and community facilities to \$3.7 billion, with \$1.4 billion set aside for acquiring and developing public open spaces and parks. This was ahead of infrastructure as the single biggest increase within the budget.



Improving equity of access to green space

Kingham says another finding of his team’s study was that people in lower socioeconomic areas tended to have less access to good-quality green spaces. “All green space is not the same.”

This is why Auckland Council's [Urban Ngahere \(Forest\) Strategy](#) is vital to the health of the city. It aims to address the unequal distribution of trees across the region and increase the benefits of a green city for all.

[*Find out more about the Urban Ngahere Strategy*](#)

It also aims to undo some of the damage done by urbanisation, rising inequality and climate change. The plan is to increase Auckland's average tree-canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent, while targeting areas where cover is scarce, such as parts of south Auckland, so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent cover.

Councillor Penny Hulse, chair of the council's Environment and Community Committee, says Auckland's rapid urban growth has swallowed up native bush and open spaces.

"It hasn't always been the norm to replant trees in areas that have been developed since the 1980s," she says. "With higher-density housing we've lost a lot of urban trees, as people haven't always valued them as much as they should."

Hulse says so-called "leafy suburbs" have fantastic tree cover, but the urban canopy is not evenly distributed across Auckland. In some neighbourhoods, streetscape planting – where trees are planted along the roadside – is also lacking.

"The amalgamation of Auckland's former councils means we get to look across the whole region to see where those gaps are," she says. "Among the lowest on the canopy cover statistics are places like Ōtara and Papatoetoe. We'd like to make them as leafy as the suburbs in Waitematā, not just because it's beautiful, but because it's better for communities."

'Knowing, growing and protecting'

The Urban Ngahere Strategy is underpinned by a three-pillar framework: knowing, growing and protecting. This involves tracking the size, health, condition and distribution of trees around Auckland and increasing the number to boost the benefits and address inequity, while also protecting existing trees.

Hulse says local boards are organising planting in areas that have been degraded, and Mayor Phil Goff's [Million Trees programme](#) is a great example of a planting project making big strides. Under the scheme, 648,000 trees were planted around Auckland in the first two planting seasons, and the millionth tree is being planted in Tōtara Park on 14 June. Auckland Council collaborates with a range of groups on the plantings, from schools, to community groups, to prison inmates.

"We're getting huge numbers of volunteers for planting," Goff says. "They're not as fast as the professionals we use, but they're there and ready. It's all about what you want to leave as a legacy. I went and planted 50 native trees, and I'm going to take my grandkids back there and show them the trees when they're 30, 40, 50 metres high. People get a thrill out of that and know we're undoing some of the damage done; they see it as a way they can make a difference."



Hulse says planting more trees now is crucial to combat growing inequity as the climate gets warmer.

“Climate change is talked about as an inequity magnifier. In other words, the people most vulnerable to climate change are those at the challenging end of the social scale, and if you look at where the least tree cover is, it’s the vulnerable areas. Internationally, it’s been shown that communities who live in areas where there are lots of trees are able to adapt to warmth more easily, so let’s address those two things together.”

Share

-
-
-

-

[Back to News](#)

RELATED



14-24 YEAR OLDS 2 JUN 2022

Wanted: Users for Ōpaheke Sports Park



MAYOR 1 JUN 2022

Goff unveils final Climate Action Budget proposal



02 JUN 2022 - 12 JUN 2022

Auckland Festival of Photography



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

The cutting of trees on roads like ours that causes blind spots after 5 years of being left. Check Javelin Close Gulf Harbour and it is now blind both ways and we used to get the public trees cut back every year. Keep rubbish bins at all beaches and parks for Dog Poo and it has not been thought through properly



#7590



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

Fire the whole of Auckland Transport and consolidate back office services as planned. Fewer cycle ways and climate change nonsense and repair all the roads from the top of the country to the bottom and build a second harbour crossing. And keep the ferry and gulf harbour and make it possible for more sailings not less to get cars off the road again. Also stop the sale of Hammerhead and Gulf Harbour Country Club sub division and the planned 1000 houses. We do not want it end up like the golf course at Red beach which now has around 2000 houses on flood planes.

Also fire all the staff who under labour have been sucking at the public funds as promised by Mr Brown. Stop talking about it and get on with the plan to roll every last person who isn't contributing to the new and improved system.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Agree there is no money left but please keep the Gulf Harbour Ferry to keep cars off the road and publicise it and get it back to running at full speed when 1000 cars of the road a week at least and the public want weekend ferries from here as well. It's not too late if you can redirect funds. We don't care if they are electric we just want our ferry

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

Ferries for Gulf Harbour. A covered coffee shop and station on the point where you can catch it in all weather like Birkenhead point. New car parks and please keep the park and rides free if you want people to take public transport. It has to be free parking or otherwise more people will just give up and get back in their cars

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

Cycleways and electric buses. Wait for hydrogen and much cleaner option as so many people are already backing away from electric due to the waste created from lithium batteries



#7590



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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

If you find an investor to sponsor the stadium or even multiple investors and it was run privately it would work look at Vector

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 the airport is a poor investment and we should sell the shares and use the money to fund service delivery not a balance sheet which no one cares about

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 central for a reason but now with growing cruise liners etc coming it needs to be better managed

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#7590



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 it would impact ferries and roads and it is bad enough already

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7590



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

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



#7590



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and 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.	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



#7590



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

Council needs to get back to basics and provide public transport like ferries and buses and better safer roads and stop all the woke nonsense

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

Money needs to be diverted back to core service delivery and provide the above services. No more money wasted on cycleways, electrification until all core services are provided efficiently.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please keep the Gulf Harbour ferry and think about improving it back to 360 Discovery days when there around 8 sailings a day and the public would also like access on the weekends once sailings are back to peak levels. Our infrastructure can not take another 1000 houses on the planned Gulf Harbour Country Club



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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

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

No. I am already paying astronomical amount of rate

I have worked hard all my life to have my own home and now when I am retired the Council chase me out from my property

People on pension and low income earner is struggling this ever increasing rate



#7600



It is very easy for the Council to put the rate up instead of reducing multimillion projects and cutting down on the staff which is not needed at the Council

The last years the employment in the council ballooned up

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

Cut down on multimillion and billion amount of projects and go back to basic provide first class maintenance on streets, waters etc

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

The people is battling to put food on the table, don't have extra money to spend on rate increase

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

Street and water maintenance

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

All multimillion projects and the salary of ballooned up council staff with high salaries

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

the stadium is only one stadium on the North Shore which worked very well until the Council took over



#7600



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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#7600



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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7600



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and 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?



#7600



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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, 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 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	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7604



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?



#7604



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7604



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



#7604



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



#7604



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

Tell us why

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

Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I support 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.	Fairly Important



#7604



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.	Not Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Fairly Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7628



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improve safety and the most important works first please.

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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



#7628



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7628



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

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



#7628



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7628



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	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?



#7632



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It seems a reasonable balance and keeping the city safe and moving is important

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

The stadium is an asset not a liability. We do not want to spend more to get less and in the process have to sell off land to do it. Such an option would be a massive backward step for 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)?

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

Tell us why:

Council investment is and should be in the city and its assets, not shares in unrelated commercial companies. Any spare cash should be used to reduce councils debt, with corresponding reduction to the debt ceiling to prevent re-borrowing in non emergency situations.

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



#7632



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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, and its operations, are an asset of the city, should be controlled by the city and is an excellent investment for the city. The profit from the port operation should be optimised, but retained for the city, not be sold to commercial interests.

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

Other

Tell us here:

Repay council debt.

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

Tell us here:

The council must by the nature of its holding already effectively self insure most of its risk, why would it not self ensure the rest. I am in favour of the self insurance principal, although of course the devil is in the detail and we must trust the council organisation to sort out those details.

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

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

Tell us why:

We cannot afford the port not to maximise its operations and profit. We already have Wynyard and need lower rates and better service more than redevelopment of Cook and Marsden wharf.



#7632



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Same reasons as the previous question.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7632



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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



#7632



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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?

It is very hard to differentiate between local board and council priorities and The level of delegation to the local boards is difficult to understand

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

Council to Work with Government to ensure that we have an excellent train and bus service for Auckland



#7634



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

No more funding for Council meetings to have lunches and morning/afternoon teas provided.

No free alcohol in mayor's office - if s/he want to entertain somebody in the office buy the alcohol themselves

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think it's necessary to have raised pedestrian crossings near schools and shopping areas. Too many people speed in their cars and pedestrians need to feel safe.

Cycle ways are essential for cyclist safety as they are vulnerable

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

Increase parking at bus/train stations, so there is more provision for people to use public transport.

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Prior to the amalgamation of local Councils into the so called super city North Harbour Stadium had sports, entertainment and cultural groups using the stadium. Under present management the stadium has gone down hill.



#7634



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 setting up the Auckland Future Fund as proposed would only benefit interests such as the one of Big Four Consultancy Firms (eg. PwC, Deloitte etc) who would act as a 'professional' fund manager, as well as Investment companies (such as Craig's Investment) who have a vested interest in such a Fund and would take huge slices of money in fees for their so called services.

Auckland should retain its 1% of Auckland Airport shares. I was against the previous sale of the Airport shares by Brown - again a company that has/had vested interest in the sales of these shares (receiving huge fees) gives a glowing recommendation for the sale. The money that was left from the previous sale seems to have gone into a big hole.

Previously Brown had negative views on consultants what has made him change his 'mind'.

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

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

Tell us here:

Under the current management, the port is making substantial profits why give these to a private port operator

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#7634



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7634



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

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



#7634



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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 other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important



#7634



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

Very Important

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do 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?

Council needs to do more of its work in-house. It is obvious that the outsourcing model is not producing value and council is not getting competitive prices for work done on behalf of ratepayers. Council should enforce lower level bylaws more astutely. Parking, dogs, illegal dumping etc. I would also like to Council to proactively care for the



#7639



environment, stop excess packaging, stop garden centres selling invasive species, put some onus on urbanites to care for the environment, not just farmers.

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

Stop building motorways in the city. We live on the North Shore. We watched as circa \$300m and 2 years was spent to joining the western and northern motorways together. Result: traffic jam has been moved 700 metres south and made a bit worse. Also up this way, Penlink has now started. This will move the traffic jam from Whangaparāoa to the motorway on Dairy Flat and make it worse for everyone living north of Dairy Flat. We have to spend the money on public transport, that is the only way we will solve transport times in the peak.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support public transport but also active transport. Being able to get about town using own's own energy is important to greater well being of the population. We are a country of lazy, unhealthy fatties, especially our kids and have become far too dependent on cars for even the shortest of trips. Also, buses in the city need more priority. As it stands they too often get caught up in traffic.

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

Make active transport a viable option via a joined-up network of micro-transport vehicles (scooters, ebikes etc. - light single person vehicles capable of 20-30km/h.)

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

More roads. Complete waste of time. Anyone who disagrees should be sent to LA, California and made to commute for a week by car. It's an apocalyptic nightmare and this is where we are heading under our car-centric planning.

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



#7639



Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Let someone else have a go at managing it. If that does not work, look at redevelopment. For god's sake do not sell it, Albany is heading for high intensity residential and needs public spaces!!

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

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

Tell us why:

Don't sell any more assets. The proceeds will just be squandered and the residents will be poorer in the long term as this asset continues to grow in value.

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

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

Tell us here:

Keep the port and run it properly. Don't move it anywhere.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#7639



The port is a solid asset that, managed well, will provide good returns to ratepayers.

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

Stop messing about with it. Get on with other important projects and don't start a new one.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Stop messing about with it. Get on with other important projects and don't start a new one. It's fine as a part of the port. We don't need ANOTHER stadium to close in 15 years or yet more retail space or overpriced apartments. Stop looking for new projects and get one and deliver the ones already started or needed.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7639



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



#7639



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

We need to protect the environment. It is so much more expensive to try and fix it later once it has been spoiled. Paying for rubbish disposal is like metering water. It is the only way to get people to take care of it. All rubbish disposal should be "pay as you throw". Rates funded rubbish incentivises nobody to take responsibility for the amount of rubbish they generate.

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7639



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

These are all great but the private sector should be responsible for the risks of diversity events etc.

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

Greenways, protection of sea, soil and fresh water.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?



#7640



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#7640



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7640



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



#7640



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



#7643



- 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:

Better management to an already established stadium close to transport, makes total financial sense. Management should encourage more and better events to hold. Upgrade the stadium! And keep it. Once gone it's gone, and will fall under yet another stadium debate costing tax payer money again.... For years to come when needed.



#7643



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



#7643



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



#7643



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

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

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

· 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	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	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7647



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I disagree with stopping some of the raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

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

Public transport - enhancing the efficiency and consistency of it all, busses, trains etc etc

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

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

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

Tell us why:

I am highly AGAINST the redevelopment of the stadium due to this potentially including deconstruction (as stated in the LTP) of parts of the stadium and selling of land, with NO guarantee that this will be reinvested back into the North Harbour Stadium and back into the North Harbour Region.

The way that the above is phrased and presented is incredibly biased and misleads people to choose a certain option. "Redevelopment", sounds lovely to read straight off the BAT - but if you read the proposal - deconstruction is a possibility AND there is NO promise or guarantee that the funds from this will be redeveloped and put BACK into the North Harbour stadium to get it functioning as it should be.

Change of operational management needs to occur and would be beneficial to ensure that the stadium is being utilised as it should and also being maintained as it should. Currently, neither are occurring.

A change in management NEEDS to allow for an increase in accessibility and usage by the North Harbour region and the community. It needs to be feasible, user-friendly and able to be genuinely utilised by the North Harbour region.



#7647



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

Other



#7647



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7647



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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
--	----------------



#7647



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.	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 these priorities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do 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	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?

Do more for environment and climate change mitigation

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



#7665



Less on focusing on unsustainable growth

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Haven't had time to read proposal, process it...

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

More on cycleways, pedestrian crossings - anything to get people moving in a sustainable way

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

Less on destructive unsustainable growth that is costing the environment and contributing to climate change

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

Haven't read stadium proposal or really care about it

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

Haven't had time to read it, what ever is intergenerationally more sustainable



#7665



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

Haven't read it, whatever is more intergenerationally and environmentally sustainable

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:

As above, whatever is more environmentally sustainable

4d. Do you have 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

Support



#7665



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



#7665



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

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

Support the long term environmentally sustainable options



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

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

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

Living in Whangaparaoa, I would be happy to pay more if I knew that there would be a EFFICIENT, RELIABLE, WEEKDAY & WEEKENDS FERRY SERVICE (water taxies) to not only Auckland City, but along the North shore and into Hobsonville. Living here 20 years and have yet to see a service that accolades the North Shore population.



#7684



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

STOP BUILDING Urban sprawl and get transport & services infrastructure in place first.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I understand there is a limited budget, but only a reliable affordable public transport can solve the bottle necks of Auckland. Do things well & do them once! Fulton Hogan have NOT learned how to fix roads to last! Maybe get a better solution!

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

As above utilising the sea around Auckland to transport the population to where they need to go when they need to go and come back!

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

BUILDING ROADS & HIGH RISE UNITS Plus URBAN SPRAWL!

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

Other

Tell us why:

The Stadium is an asset to the community and just the lack of parking is an issue! Plus the Park & Ride is totally inadequate and too far away from the stadium and shops! A multi story built next to the Stadium is needed.



#7684



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

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:

There is way too much info to digest in one attempt to do this survey! It should be split up into separate ones!

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



#7684



Other

Tell us why:

Again too much to compute on 1st reading of this survey! I may not get time to revisit it?

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7684



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

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

Too much info to digest!

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#7684



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

There is not enough being done to create safe path ways from Gulf Harbout to Manly!
Or paths from the Ferry into Gulf Harbour!

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

STOP BUILDING on Whangaparaoa Peninsular! It is being smothered!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Litter collection from our streets

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

Less consultation.



#7690



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Spend more on pedestrian facilities.

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

Spend more on pedestrian facilities, particularly a decent path from albaney bus station to Albany mall, and Akoranga station to Takapuna.

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

Car parking facilities.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Better use of the land eg sell it for higher density housing.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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



#7690



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#7690



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



#7690



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I don't know

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

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



#7690



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?

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

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

Reign in building multi-story apartments and put more protection around trees so we do not lose so many to building

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



#7725



Less work in city centre and spend more in the surrounding communities. Reduce road/rail spending in the city centre. With good fibre connections, people can work in smaller hubs closer to where they live. Less commuting, less traffic. Better work-life balance. Auckland is just another city, there are plenty of those. Having technical working hubs in more pleasant environments will make us different. Local cafes and shops will thrive at the expense of their city centre counterparts.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Fuel tax makes those who use the roads most fund them. If the tax is removed, it seems unfair to tax many people who use their cars infrequently. Maybe introduce a mileage road tax for petrol cars like is done for diesel

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

Buses. You get a lot of busses for the cost of a rail link. Busses are more flexible and easy to change routes. Railway lines are not.

Ferries. Some competition may help keep prices down. Safety standards must be measured and enforced by the council.

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

City centre upgrades

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We have stadiums in the city centre. If you are keen to watch a match, it is not too far to travel.



#7725



Making the stadium something that is useful to wider range of the community would be a better use of space. Basketball courts, meeting rooms, maker spaces, youth clubs, visiting lecture spaces, recording studios. You can do a lot. If well designed, the building could be flexible (ie movable walls to increase room sizes as needed etc)

I clicked "change operational management" as the current management does not seem to be working.

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

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

Tell us why:

Gambling on the share market has no place in local government. You have a budget and should spend it wisely and not hope for the stock market to possibly provide a boost in the future.

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

Other

Tell us here:

You may choose to lease parts of the port to earn income. Investing profits in a fund I am not happy about

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#7725



See above. Stock markets can crash. If China invades Taiwan and Aus/Nz get dragged into blockades/sanctios, it can all go pear shaped very quickly.

If this is tax payers money, I think it is wrong to gamble with it. Balance the books instead.

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7725



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



#7725



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
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?

IMPROVED SPORTS FACILITIES.

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



#7726



wasted hundreds of thousands on poor quality contractors performance for the maintenance of sporting facilities. under cut the market and have destroyed the facilities and put massive stress on the sporting organisations, costing us money and impacting the community.

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 is completely under utilised. a high quality sport facility that the community can utilise is desperately needed. thousand of junior, youth ,senior, male and female sports players could benefit, not just 30 professional players every now and then.

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



#7726



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

I don't know



#7726



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



#7726



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and 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	Not Important



#7726



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.	Not Important

Tell us why

young people need to be active and healthy, they need to engage in sports to socialise and promote mental health.

you need to support our sports such as football and basketball, rapidly growing and high participation by juniors and youth.

7c. What 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?

Do more in education and medical care.

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

Do less unnecessary paid consultation.



#7734



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?

Other

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#7734



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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7734



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



#7734



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

I think the green food bin is not helpful and should have an option to waive the fee for the families who don't need this service.

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



#7747



I think the government should save the costs on building the cycle lanes. And leave more budgets on road maintenance and building new roads for vehicle use.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Terrible traffic. No point to charge congestion fee.

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

To build up better traffic network

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

Stop wasting on building the cycle lanes.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:



#7747



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

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



#7747



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



#7747



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

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

Local board priorities

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

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.	
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response	



#7747



Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	
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?

I am living in Milldale. All the families here are expecting the Water Loo park to be completed this year. It's a very important local project for the community. Don't stop please.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7751



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

With limited funds, it is sufficient to maintain road safety. Everything else is not the priority nor the most urgent.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Introduce competitions and events to increase revenue.

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

Will it affect the airport's operations?

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

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



#7751



Tell us here:

The city center port should be developed commercially. It is a waste to use the central area for shipping.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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

I don't know



#7751



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



#7751



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

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing 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	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7766



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We don't need more raised pedestrian crossings, especially before traffic lights - they just make traffic worse.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Went to a festival at North Harbour and it was great!! Needs to be used for more than just sports.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

I worry about who would take the lease and what their influence would be.



#7766



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 think both are good options.

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

We don't need more transported by truck.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I think there are enough public areas around the waterfront

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 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



#7766



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



#7766



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Fairly Important



#7766



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

I was sick for two weeks and have lost 10kg after swimming at one of our local beaches. The water quality is just not ok. This needs to be a high priority.

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

Needs to be more emphasis on water quality.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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.



#7776



· 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.

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)?



#7776



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.



#7776



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#7776



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

6b. Do you have 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



#7776



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.	
Continue to support activities 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.”



#7776



8. Do you have any other comments?

Please help get Mairangi Bay surf club up to a level to prevent loss of lives, gain community awesomeness across the wider region



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

keep to the core business.

Fix wastewater pipes - replace old using a planned program.

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



#7781



Do not have a limit of \$50 per week for public transport.

Less wasteful spending. Do it right the first time. No new speed bumps.

No need for signs to be changed.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not have a limit of \$50 per week for public transport.

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

Eastern and Western busway.

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

Do not have a limit of \$50 per week for public transport.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It is an asset that should be used better - concerts. It is there for the future.

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

Proceed with the proposal



#7781



Tell us why:

The fund can achieve better returns and have flexibility.

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

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

Tell us 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:

Just get the Port to be more efficient and earn a suitable profit.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

Not sure as the Port could do a better job of using and would the public make a better use. There is quite a lot of public area already, how is that going?

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



#7781



I don't know

Tell us why:

same as above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7781



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



#7781



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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7793



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?



#7793



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7793



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

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



#7793



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

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

Development of the sporting facilities infrastructure especially for indoor facilities. As you have let the ball drop, we are not ridiculously short in indoor facilities in the right locations, so indoor sports have to travel to hamilton to play. then you invest in the



#7797



south, with no real plan and no support. its a flipping joke, to get votes. face the real facts and implement a proper plan without the politics.

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

wasting money on consultants

incompetent staff

auckland tataki should not be running stadiums as they are incompetent

overpaid managers

managing conflicts of staff for personal gain and political impact eg auckland tataki

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

do not support reduction of cycle ways, the healthiest, fittest least traffic bound cities in the world have the most cycle ways. if we cut those plans out we are killing our health of us, and our future young people. if we want auckland to be the most liveable city we need to plan so it really is. cycle ways is a critical part of this to reduce traffic, carbon footprint, and most importantly health and well being of our people. we are not here to look after the pompous fat white man in their cars with car parks downtown.

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

cycle ways , cycle skills training, facilities to move bikes across water, and park in the city, like the netherlands etc

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

car parking, auckland tataki

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



#7797



Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management, Other

Tell us why:

Remove the biggest burden to the city which is Eden Park. It would be great if Council just dropped 10 million a year on North Harbour Stadium to see if it would become successful. Eden Park still bleeds more money than any other stadium in the country. Since the stadium was under the new management of RFA and Auckland Tataki it has gone downhill. I am not sure if it is the incompetence of the organisations, overpriced contractors, but reality is the community has been frozen out of the facility when it was used everyday. It is now overpriced, poorly managed and communicated. Reduction of events, due to politics, and excuses - looks like a deliberate attempt to run the best stadium in the country to the ground. This is amazing since it ran the U20 World Cup Final, Football World Cup qualifiers for NZ, All Black Tests, unbelievable World Cup rugby games, plus massive conferences and dinners. Then when a mistake was made, not repairing them, like the hole in the stadium for baseball. People should have been fired over this. Plus the lies and the politics. It is the only stadium in the city accessible in a transport hub. Has space to be further developed, has cricket ovals, in a growing population with a demographic which has access to money. Looks like a total manipulation of management. This has been exacerbated by the politics in recent times, with the chair, deputy chair and CEO trying to influence the vote. They should be fired as this is totally inappropriate behaviour. I don't see and leaders in the community in other sections of Council or the plan openly trying to manipulate the vote. It's an utter disgrace and should have an inquiry. Also the conflicts of interest for those people in places of power. Utter joke and some people need to pay the price.

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

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

Tell us why:

Don't sell city assets. Manage better through tough times. Stop hiring incompetent overpaid people that are part of your club.



#7797



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

build the stadium on the waterfront, get rid of eden park

5b. What option do you prefer 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?



#7797



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



#7797



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, 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 all priorities

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

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



#7797



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

Tell us why

community is where people get most benefit. centralised decisionmaking and the auckland super city is a total failure. we the people have been ripped of by the centralisation model

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

very important

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?



#7797



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

Exceptional wise plans. again local clever people that know whats best for their communities. Well thought out. more investment should happen at the community level.

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

exceptional. should receive more investment



#7797



Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Very Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Very Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Very Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Very Important



#7797



Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.

Fairly Important

Tell us why

again, local people that know whats best for their community. need to support local

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

very good, and aligned to community needs

Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Very Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	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



#7797



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.	Very Important

Tell us why

again planning and utilising opportunities to improve the community.

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

very common sense approach to plans and needs which future proof opportunities for local communities

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?



#7797



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

Tell us why

the incredible changes in Upper harbour and the diverse community mean local needs need to be observed. very clever people working for the benefit of the local community, with well thought out plans that future proof the local community

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

very good, and very wise

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.



#7797



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

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?

partner with local community and see central auckland funding from the politicians supporting their own interests

8. Do you have any other comments?

the CCOs need to have more accountability from independent review groups. the behaviour of some of their staff, and leaders in governance is unacceptable. plus accountability to staff management and the staff bullying that occurs internally and into the community is unacceptable. a full scale external independent review is required for the value and return on them to the community. what is the value and return on every dollar for every dollar spent and wasted by them. Where is the real accountability.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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?

Fund ferry services, especially the outer gulf service like gulf harbour. Fares should also align in same way as inner \$50 max daily limit.

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



#7802



Less speed humps and bike lanes. Stop gold plating stations and bus shelters. Think in a pragmatic way. Like why cant bus shelters just be more cost effective corrugated iron sheds like old days. We need more bus shelters not less extravagant ones.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support these initiatives but we need the gulf harbour ferry included.

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

Gulf Harbour Ferry

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

Expensive Cycle Ways, gold plated railway stations and bus shelters and Speed Humps. abolish Auckland Transport CCO. Governance should be under elected Auckland Council electives.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

We use it

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

Proceed with the proposal



#7802



Tell us why:

This investment is just supporting a private organisation. They can finance themselves, let the market decide auckland airport fate. Council needs to focus on core utilities and community responsibilities like water, rubbish and getting people moving around the city, i.e. transport to work

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

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port, and retain land for city revitalisation such as commercial use hotels, apartments, bars, shopping and recreation like the viaduct. Aucklanders can't wait another 35 years for this to happen.

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:

Any money from the port should be used to invest in planning how we shift the port immediately and revitalise the port land. Require both central government and local government to make this happen.

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

Tell us here:

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

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



#7802



Tell us why:

We need the port moved out of auckland

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7802



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

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

Please include the Gulf Harbour ferry service in your costings. This is a must have transportation for the eastern end Whangaparāoa peninsular community.

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7802



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

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

Require to retain the Gulf Harbour ferry and Gulf Harbour Country Club green space as to current green space zoning.

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



#7802



Must include retaining and optimising the Gulf Harbour Ferry Service. To increase this service to be more frequent and 7 days a week. The roads are getting so busy people are not able to use it to get to work or university education. The ferry is the only way and is a crucial transport link to the city for the eastern end Whangaparaoa 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	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?

Protecting the beach water quality critical

Recycling more



#7826



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

Helping developers

Social housing should be central government issue

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#7826



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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#7826



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



#7826



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

Support

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

Developers should be contributing more

Many of these options benefit people who don't pay any rates which seems unfair

Priorities should be beach water quality

Local board priorities

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

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

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

Very Important

Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide

Very Important



#7826



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

Tell us why

Priority is developing living spaces and clean water

Then bringing in income

Then cultural identity

All are important but maintaining an environment where people want to have their kids grow up is critical

Places to go and spend time are more important than

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



#7826



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

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

Tell us why



#7826



7c. What 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?

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7829



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Light rail from north shore

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

Raised traffic slowers,

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:



#7829



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#7829



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



#7829



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

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



#7829



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?

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



#7833



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#7833



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7833



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

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



#7833



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7833



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

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7837



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?



#7837



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7837



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

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



#7837



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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.	



#7837



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

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Stop spending on cycle ways on main routes they are not cost effective.

Reduce spending on the 'nice to haves' ; concentrate on the 'must haves'



#7838



Stop wasting money on speed bumps and raised pedestrian crossings.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make more use of ferries with connecting bus services.

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

Fast ferries

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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This stadium was always very successful when under local management. To local residents it appears that The Council has deliberately run down its use.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#7838



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

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

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:

Captain Cook and Marsden are not necessary for POAL operations

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

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

Tell us why:



#7838



It is mainly used as a car park for offloading car ships. Unload cars directly to offsite locations

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7838



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Very Important
--	----------------



#7838



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

Tell us why

"Greenways' should be only within local areas.

The proposal for walkways/cycleways on Penlink is a waste of money which should be spent on 4 traffic lanes.

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

Too much focus on 'nice to haves'

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7842



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

We need a cycleway along the side of the north motorway connecting the city with the Albany cycleway. How do we get a better Cycle connection across the Harbour?

2b. 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:



#7842



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#7842



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



#7842



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7842



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	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?



#7850



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?



#7850



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7850



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



#7850



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Not Important



#7850



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

Re the continuation of activities that promote vibrancy, diversity etc.

Community should do this, not the council. Council's responsibility should not extend to this.,

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

Somewhat agree

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Looking after nature and increasing investment in public transportation, which also aids environmental protection.

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



#7851



I think there are too many urban Local Boards, and too few Rural Local Boards. I think amalgamation of 2 or 3 urban local boards, to allow for 1-2 extra rural local would better serve Auckland. This is especially so in Rodney which could be split into 2 local board areas at least, as it is such a large area of Auckland.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Better incentives for car pooling and making public transport cheaper to access with help free up the transportation network and help the environment also. If Auckland wants to be an international city destination, it needs to appeal in this regard or it will be falling behind the rest of the world and become a less attractive destination, just a transit point for NZ- the Picton of the North Island.

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

Rail to Auckland Airport from the city center- again, if Auckland wants to be an international city destination, it needs to keep up with the rest of the world.

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

Local Board funding. 21 Local boards is too many. Large administrative expense that should be condensed into much fewer urban local boards, and a few more rural local boards, but overall, less local boards.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Keeping a large seated stadium in northern Auckland will enable more international sporting events to be held in Auckland. Look at how successful the women's football world cup was. Also adding a public swimming pool facility there would benefit the growing northern community.



#7851



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

Leasing the port will only result in higher prices for port services. This proposal would cost Aucklands more as all supplies, including retailers, would have to pass these increased costs onto their customers- it is a counter productive proposal.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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



#7851



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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7851



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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



#7851



I support all priorities

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

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

Tell us why

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



#7851



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	As proposed

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7877



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improving public transport will lead to greater use and bring the benefits desired (eg reduce cars emissions etc)

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

Please Do NOT exclude pine harbour and gulf harbour from the proposed fare cap.

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

Dedicated continuous bus lanes for the express services east, west and north shore.

What's the point of a bus lane for only part of its route !.

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 evident it's being mismanaged (eg lack of events and to build such a facility in future will be more expensive.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Paying down debt reduces interest payments.



#7877



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

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

Public benefit and allows people to get closer to the harbour.

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

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

Tell us why:



#7877

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

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



#7877



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



#7877



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?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please fund parking at the new bus terminal at the Penlink, otherwise local streets will become parking lots and it also means someone else has to make a car journey to the bus station.

Please fund the gulf harbour ferry



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Other

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

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

Get rid of the idiots that decide removing bins is a good idea. Get rid of thr idiots that put a pedestrian crossing every three metres. Get rid of the idiots that have ruined the



#7879



local road surfaces. GST rid of the idiots that waste time on woke issues (trans, Gaza etc). That should save millions in salaries.

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?

Other

Tell us here:



#7879



Get rid of the port. Upgrade train line to Whangārei

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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



#7879



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



#7879



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important



#7879



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#7898



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

A weekly cap must apply to all public transport services including outer harbour ferry services like Gulf Harbour. This service has been decimated since COVID and the idea of charging a premium for a sub-standard service is outrageous. The primary goal must be to restore and then provide better service (frequency & reliability). We desperately need 7 day service and more frequency throughout the day at a reasonable cost. This would greatly alleviate traffic pressures across the peninsula, which Penlink will not resolve anyways. This should lead to increased patronage, leading to increased fare revenue. Gulf Harbour fares are already expensive and a further increase would discourage patronage and push even more people on the peninsula back into cars. Potentially charging for parking at the Hibiscus coast station is also a terrible idea, when there is no fast bus connection from Army Bay to the park and ride. Connector bus services are much slower and less convenient. It takes almost an hour on the bus to just get to the park and ride, late afternoon connections back are also terrible and really increase overall travel time. Significant travel times must be recognised when contemplating charges for parking.

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know



#7898



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#7898

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

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



#7898



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

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



#7898



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?

Auckland Transport must retain the Gulf Harbour Ferry route to enable an integrated transport system. The service has been decimated since COVID and disestablishing will have wide reaching impacts on the immediate community but also traffic congestion on the motorway as busses simply to not provide comparable services in terms of travel time and comfort. It must be a priority to restore previous service levels and then enhance to a 7 days service with more times throughout the day on faster ferries. The Hibiscus Coast population is still growing rapidly and with one road in/out, a fast, affordable and reliable ferry service is essential. Penlink will not resolve this issue.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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 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?

Clean public toilets, emptied rubbish bins to keep litter off streets as well as reducing pests

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



#7908



General rubbish bins could even go 3 weekly if everyone recycles properly

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Public transportation needs to be simpler to travel on, better routes etc

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

Crime reduction, cctv at constellation bus depot where there is crime and asb

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

Arts

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

Other

Tell us why:

Never seems to be open, not sure what goes on 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:

Don't know enough about it



#7908



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

I don't know



#7908



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



#7908



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

Pls leave the bins as pay as you go, I don't put mine out unless full, every maybe 3 weeks

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I don't know

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

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



#7908



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?

Basic services should be covered but costs kept as low as possible, we are all feeling the pinch and costs can be saved.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

Completely cut the \$430M for lower cost cycleways. This is a huge figure for something that is hardly used by Aucklanders. Cycleways could potentially started up in the future when we have more money.



#7919



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Makes sense except cycleways

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

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

Completely cut the \$430M for lower cost cycleways. This is a huge figure for something that is hardly used by Aucklanders. Cycleways could potentially started up in the future when we have more money.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

As Auckland grows, especially in the north, the stadium is likely to become more used.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Other



#7919



Tell us here:

The Port is a strategic asset to NZ. I am concerned if we lease the port and the company is unable to make the money it has invested it could leave the asset to rot (similar to what happened to Waiwera). I would support lease as long as there was a clause that allowed council to regain control in the event of poor management reducing the flow or extreme pricing of containers through 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:

Rates expenses are too high we need to get this under control.

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

Tell us here:

Makes sense

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

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

Tell us why:

We need to get costs under control. Any additional cost is something that has to be funded by rate payers.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#7919



Tell us why:

We need to get costs under control. Any additional cost is something that has to be funded by rate payers.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7919



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I 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
--	------------------



#7919



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

Tell us why

7c. What 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?



#7925



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Redevelop the stadium to make it multi purpose and have a diverse group of people to manage it - diverse in interests and community associations

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

The POA should be highly profitable k- if well managed.



#7925



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

A difficult but we must invest in the future of this city

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

Tell us here:

N/A

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council 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



#7925



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



#7925



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

N/A

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I 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



#7925



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

N/A

8. Do you have any other comments?

N/A



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?



#7967



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?



#7967



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7967



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

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



#7967



Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#7967



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

Fitness, safety, environment first

7c. What 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	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?

More development in local areas where people live.

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



#7989



A lot less raised Pedestrian crossings. The number we have in our small area where I live is a Joke.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

There has to be a balance between public transport users and those who cannot get to work or recreation using public transport. Thought has to be for both groups.

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

Local parks and green spaces.

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

Traffic management, raised pedestrian crossings, cycleways on roads (these are just dangerous)

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Auckland council has mismanaged this centre, this needs to go back to private management, so North Shore People have events and sporting events in Their area

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

Proceed with the proposal



#7989



Tell us why:

Necessary for future proofing 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:

This needs to be owned by the people of Auckland to secure our future needs.

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

This could be a valuable asset for everyone to enjoy. Not just cars.



#7989

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

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

Tell us why:

As above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#7989



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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



#7989



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

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

Sound good, but will they happen?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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.



#8004



- 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)?



#8004



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.



#8004



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8004



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

6b. Do you have 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



#8004



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

“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 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	As proposed

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

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



#8010



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:



#8010



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#8010



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#8010



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?

Negotiate a deal with one power provider to Auckland city that would reduce power costs for most consumers and allow ratepayers to use savings from this to help in paying increased rates.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8015



Less provision and development of sporting facilities locally

but work with private providers to develop large key hubs throughout the city accessible by public transport.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

People will do what is convenient and easy. However it must also be safe and comfortable so personal security is important. Reliability of timetables is also key.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

1. Security. 2 Heavy rail from central Auckland to the west coast, to the airport ,and south and to the North in some capacity.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

I think get our main high use roads upgraded first and reduce spend on periphery roads with less traffic.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

I think we need new thinking here. The North is a high growth area and we will need a Northern hub for the future. How do we in the meantime utilize this space for other things other than sport. Business-concerts -shows- meetings Busway direct from the stadium to central Auckland ?



#8015



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Potential to create income stream ongoing to reduce pressure on rate payers. We are not signing away the rights to the port land. By back shares of the airport with fund money if the asset performs.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

We have a shortfall now and we need to address these infrastructure problems now (they have been neglected over many years by successive councils and government) but the impact on rates will be severe in the short term if we do not find alternative funding sources.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 generate alternative funding streams outside of continuous rating hikes.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#8015



We need to have ongoing engagement with the Minister for Auckland to establish how they can assist in the ongoing infrastructure costs such as second crossing of the Waitemata, rail development, state Highway 1 development and diverting more of the percentage petrol tax paid by Aucklanders to Auckland roads by percentage to reflect of what we are currently contributing. Too much is being diverted to roads outside of Auckland.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Devaluation of the Port offering to private companies.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

By delaying make it more attractive to private lessee but gain area in the future when we have more development money.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#8015



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8015



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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



#8015



Continue to support activities 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 would far more have renewing infrastructure and maintenance of this as priority.
There is a lot of older areas that need work not to mention maintenance of streets to prevent flooding.

7c. What 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?



#8022



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?



#8022



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest 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



#8022



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8022



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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 in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Not Important



#8022



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?

Nothing exciting

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?



#8029



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

North Shore 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?

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?



#8029



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Do not support



#8029



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8029



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Not Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	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



#8029



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	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?



#8062



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because we do not need roads chip sealed - noisy, and we do not need more pedestrian crossings- we have too many

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Beuase it used to be run well and now 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)?

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:



#8062



Because a private company would run it better and be more accountable than council

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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



#8062



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#8062



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Fairly Important



#8062



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	
Water	
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

you probably dont need to do less but have LESS PEOPLE just hanging about
NO LOOKERS ON WHICH WE SEE ALOT OF WHEN OUT AND ABOUT IN
AUCKLAND



#8087



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes its not council business to arrange and pay for any sporting or entertainment events in the city

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

again so many workers just hanging about , get them to work their 8 hours for their pay

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

NO

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

YES WAGES FOR THOSE LOOKERS ON

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Needs more usage so why so underused , must be BAD 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)?

Other



#8087



Tell us why:

yes i think the fund is a good idea to get good returns for the city from their assets
JUST MAKE SURE YOU HAVE VERY COMPETENT MANAGEMENT

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

well the PORT has been a very very poor earner for the council under its Present ?
Past management LOOK AT TAURANGA

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Because councils when they see one dollar they think they can SPEND TWO DOLLARS

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#8087



Tell us why:

there must be a better use for the wharves than A CAR PARK

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

well i think someone could better utilise this space

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Do not support



#8087



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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?

YES JUST SPEND OUR MONEY WISELY NOT WASTEFULLY

I thought this was why we voted in Mayor Brown !! Not again unless his actions improve dramatically

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#8087



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.	
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



#8087



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?



#8091



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 ped crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#8091



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#8091



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8091



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#8091



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

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,	Fairly Important



#8091



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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8094



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:

This a valuable asset to the north of the Auckland region and in my view has been poorly managed. Many very successful events were held at the venue prior to management being handed over to Council.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

This a great idea provided the fund is adequately protected from future Councils who may choose to plunder it for less than satisfactory purposes.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#8094



Tell us here:

Council is not an efficient port operator.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Maximise revenue from lease of the port whilst still providing for more amenity on the Auckland waterfront.

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?



#8094



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8094



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays, 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



#8094



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?

great

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
--	---------------



#8094



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	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.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

great

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?



#8094



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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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 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?



#8100



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:



#8100



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#8100



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8100



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing 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.	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



#8100



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	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.	Fairly 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



#8100



Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Fairly Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Very Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce 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 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?



#8124



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?



#8124



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#8124



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8124



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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, 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.	
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.	



#8124



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones,	



#8124



including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Howick Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have	



#8124



on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I think libraries should be looked at closely. They take up a lot of space and are not utilised as much any more as most people can do more and better research on a topic



#8159



just from a smart phone. The real estate savings could be used elsewhere by the Council.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I dont support paying for parking at park and ride. It is a great benefit for early commuters to get a free park and then on the bus. I have driven to the CBD for 30 years and for the last 4 months used Albany park and ride. Wish Id done it earlier in my working life. If I have to pay to park I will be back in the car as I have an option for parking in the city as do many people I know who have made the move to Public Transport. Council should focus on the congestion charges and provide more free parking at park and rides to get more people like me out of their cars.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

As above - provide more free Park and ride space and get cars off the road. Consider converting some of the parking around Hooten reserve to Albany bus station parking and build an over-bridge over Oteha Valley Road to connect to the existing car park. Also make the Oteha Valley Rd exit better when leaving the existing car park (providing a right turn option)

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 understood the facility ran ok and was reasonably well utilised under the North Harbour Trust Board. Perhaps try Option 3 first for 2-3 years and then review again. It seems such a waste that an amazing facility completed only in 1997 could be considered for the scrap heap. Perhaps some investment in the seating removed for



#8159



the ill fated Baseball venture should also be considered. As a compromise perhaps the council could lease out the number two ground for commercial activity.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

In all honesty it probably takes away the whole controversy around selling the AIAL shares. This way we can see a fund that will include other funding as well so not just AIAL shares and there will be a clear purpose behind the funding.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 seems to make sense from a cashflow perspective and the upfront payment will be useful. Perhaps the council could consider paying down some debt with the payment and not transfer all of it to the Future Fund?

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Couldn't it be split to the Future fund and Council Services?

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#8159



Tell us here:

I think Council should retain ownership of the Port Land to generate ongoing revenue into the 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.

Tell us why:

It makes sense in Principle but perhaps Council has to be careful how this goes. Wynyard quarter could suffer if Captain Cook and Marsden become the place to go for entertainment /commercial activities. It could be a win for the Captain Cook and Marsden

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I don't see the benefit of changing this as the Bledisloe wharf would have been upgraded to pick up Marsden and Captain Cook wharf activities under the proposal.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#8159



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#8159



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I agree that there should be increases for user pays activities (except park and ride parking -that should stay free!) in line with inflation.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#8159



Continue to support activities 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?

Glenvar Road/Vaughans Road/Okura River Road must be priorities. The new Long Bay Development has put a lot of additional pressure on the environment and infrastructure and upgrading Vaughans/Okura River Road will take pressure off roads around Torbay/Long Bay by providing a northern exit to the Long Bay Development. Glenvar Road has been an issue for many years so nothing more needs to be said about that. It is a no-brainer.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nothing to add



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#8170



- 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)?



#8170



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



#8170



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8170



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?



#8170



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 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.	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.”



#8170



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	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?

Much more money than proposed is needed for infrastructure backlog works.

Clearly, we need much more money for infrastructure renewals and upgrading. I support the pay more option but strongly suggest a "pay even more" option for key infrastructure.



#8188



Council previous popular, rather than good, fiscal decisions to keep rate rises lower than required have led us to our present situation and we should not continue this process.

My mokopuna (generation Z) are now faced with paying for fundamental infrastructure upgrading and renewals that should have been paid for by previous generations. It is grossly unfair that they should have to pay for loans for works that should have been fully funded by previous generations such as baby boomers and generation Xers. My mokopuna's generation have enough fiscal challenges saving for a deposit for their first home.

For this reason, I see rate funding for infrastructure catch-up work, rather than loans, being the only fair way to fund the backlog of infrastructure work. Most home owning baby boomers and generation Xers should be able to easily afford it.

Auckland, like many other Councils, have historically dropped the ball on asset renewal and upgrading programs which should have been largely paid for by past and present mostly asset rich generations, like Baby Boomers and Generation Xers.

This approach is consistent with the principles of economic intergenerational equity where each generation should pay for a fair and just share of their community's infrastructure. For new assets, this would often include paying off long term loans, for older assets well past their optimal renewal dates. Future generations should not have to pay for this work.

More funds to address identified people issues associated with the 6 Outcomes sought from the Auckland Plan 2050,

The Auckland Plan 2050 (2018) described the 6 Outcomes, 20 Strategic directions and 37 Focus areas targeted for Auckland by 2050. The 2023 review of the Auckland Plan 2050 document identified that we are going backwards in most of the Strategic directions, particularly those related to individual wellbeing and trust. These are further identified and discussed under 6B below.

Accordingly, I would want to see Council spending much more money addressing the many significant "people issues" raised in the above review. There is little in the discussion document about the funding required for this important issue.

Back to basics approach

I fully agree with getting back to basics approach driven by outcomes and would be prepared to pay much more for bringing the horizontal infrastructure up to scratch, particularly the three water services and transportation networks. This includes delivering on the Outcomes from the Resilient Auckland 2016-2021 CDEM document, or an updated version of it.



#8188



This would require the Council to take back control of its CCOs and their outcomes, and to adopt a focus on outcomes within Council, rather than processes, as stated on Page 18 “Ultimately this LTP is about Auckland and Aucklanders, and council delivering outcomes for our region. An outcome focused approach to investment is included to deliver on our priorities”.

I see this as a paradigm shift from previous Council planning and funding approaches which have got Auckland infrastructure and its culture to where it is today despite the intention of the LG Act 2002, intended to prevent this situation from happening. Accordingly, I endorse the mayor’s comments and the principles in part 1

Urgent need to fund a Marine Strategy

I would also see the urgent reinstatement of the funds for development of a Marine Strategy to allow ordinary Aucklanders the ability to access e.g. the Hauraki Gulf and its beaches. Access is becoming increasingly difficult with parking at a premium and the issues caused by (e.g.) the invasive exotic seaweed *Caulerpa*, as mentioned in the mayor’s introduction, having put significant areas of the Hauraki gulf out of bounds over the last summer.

The management of our marine environment being a priority as presently it is managed by too many separate organisations often with conflicting strategies. E.g. the Fisheries Act resource utilisation objectives which reportedly are directly in conflict with the objectives of the Hauraki Marine Park Act.

Without a comprehensive Marine Strategy, future generations of marine users will not have the same opportunity to access the marine environment that past generations have had, unless they are affluent. This includes beach goers, wind surfers, boat owners, fishermen, etc.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Because of the current fiscal situation, I would like to see Council spend significantly less on libraries, administration and activities that add no real value for most ordinary Aucklanders.

Council needs to adopt the suggested back to basics approach and revert to making good rather than popular decisions.

How does Council know what its ordinary customer’s think are the priority services?



#8188



It is hard to have an objective opinion without knowing how much money is spent on the key activities.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The proposal needs to be more driven by the outcomes Aucklanders seek rather than the “internal” performance measures suggested on P 33 which are important for management but meaningless to customers.

Completing projects is process based thinking. Completing projects and having (e.g.) improved efficiency or safety outcomes with performance measures to demonstrate the achievement of the intended project benefits, is outcome-based thinking.

Basically, travellers want an efficient journey, a safe journey and an enjoyable journey by PT, car, etc. The current issue for many is that journey times are too long, often unreliable and journey times increasing.

E.g. I regularly travel by PT and private car and what is important as an outcome is the reliability of my regular journey times from Whangaparaoa Road to Queen Street. My expectation is that when Penlink is completed, my reduced journey times by PT and car at peak times, as used to justify the construction of the project, will be realised.

KiwiRail needs more money.

Given the many recent planned and unplanned disruptions to train services, I don't support the delaying of KiwiRail's maintenance costs. KiwiRail issues impact heavily on Auckland's PT users.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Developing better customer outcome-based performance measures for transportation including a common customer request centre and response performance measures for Council and AT (and Watercare).



#8188



Introducing a system for managing the unnecessary disruption to the travelling public caused by temporary traffic management by council's construction activities and utility providers. Introducing charges to third parties will only be passed onto their customers. It would be far better for those disrupting traffic by necessary infrastructure works to be strongly guided in their street opening notices by Council in respect to the installation and monitoring of their traffic management systems.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The stadium should be a prime asset for Council and under almost no circumstances should its land area be reduced to pay for the \$33m be "essential renewals" of the stadium. The funding of these works should have been allowed for as prudent financial management over past years. (e.g. by funded depreciation to cover such renewal activities.)

Accordingly based on the limited information provided, and having been a past regular user of the stadium, I support a change in its management and possible redevelopment and hope that the new management team will have the financial and entrepreneurial skills necessary to both manage whatever assets the redevelopment will have an understanding that assets do not last forever and the costs of their renewals will need to be allowed for in their long term budgeting.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#8188



Tell us why:

This is a complicated matter to have an opinion on for most people including myself.

A paradigm shift is needed in Council's fiscal planning thinking, which got us to where it is today, to ensure that my mokopuna and their yet unborn children will not be paying excessively for the past Council's past underinvestment in community infrastructure. The proposal, providing the right people with the right skills are on the board, would enable the necessary paradigm shift to happen and seem a no brainer.

I understand that Mayor Brown supports the proposal and based on what he has done or tried to do since becoming mayor, I support the proposal. I.e. I trust his judgement and opinion.

Managing future cash flows to ensure the affordability of housing for future Aucklanders and meeting the six specific or implied Outcomes of the Auckland Plan 2050 should be a priority for the future Auckland Fund. This would seem to be a significant issue needing to be addressed by people with the required financial literacy skills.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

The discussion on the port is mostly focused on the financial issues and not the other current and equally important (e.g.) Hauraki Gulf issues which Council needs to take a lead role in addressing and are not mentioned.

Specifically these include but not limited to:

1. The ability ferries to maintain their timetables due to cruise ship activities and frustrating PT users ("Close to 100 ferry sailings were cancelled or delayed in the city in December, due to cruise ships arriving or departing Princess Wharf" NZ Herald 15 Jan 2024).

Will the proposed option and the intended greater use of ferries and other PT services be adversely or negatively impacted by the recommended options?

2. The ability of cruise ships to come to Auckland and (presumably) making significant contributions to Auckland's economy.



#8188



3. The lack of a holistic coordinated Marine Users Strategy which could set out the principles of ensuring access to the Auckland marine environment for all Aucklanders and social and economic activities.

This would include a holistic strategic vision for the Hauraki Gulf, which would include visions for the port, cruise ship operation, current and future access for ordinary Aucklanders to the Gulf and its beaches, addressing the current poor environmental health of the local waters, including management of highly invasive pest seaweed species and addressing the increasing bad behaviour at beaches.

A key consideration would be future location(s) for the Ports of Auckland

4. Etc

The recommended option sounds like a good way to address an adverse financial sustainability situation, but it needs to look at the bigger picture and particularly how it aligns with the 6 Outcomes, 20 Directions and the 37 Focus Areas of the Auckland Plan 2050.

What is urgently needed is a Marine Users Strategy covering the activities of all those who have an interest in the Marine environment, especially the Hauraki Gulf.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:



#8188



Council is not looking at the big picture of the Hauraki Gulf.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Council is not looking at the big picture of the Hauraki Gulf.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support



#8188



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

ALL AREAS

BACKLOG HORIZONTAL INFRASTRUCTURE WORK SHOULD BE PAID FOR BY RATES NOT LOANS

It is morally wrong to expect future generations to be expected to pay for the shortcomings of present and past generations in respect to providing sustainable infrastructure.

Present generations, particularly baby boomers and generation Xers, should have paid for this work in their rates and are mostly very asset rich with many owning one or more houses and the average house price being around \$1.2m.

For most of these people including myself, the additional costs of a few thousand dollars a year will be small change when compared to young people in their 20s, like my mokopuna, who are struggling to get their first step on the housing ladder as Auckland becomes further divided into the “rich and poor” as mentioned above.



#8188



The funding for the backlog of work should be rate funded until the backlog has caught up. There are also other mechanisms available to Council to avoid future generations having to pay for the catch-up work, where this will be a burden for existing homeowners.

It is pointless relitigating past council decisions that have led to the present three waters and transportation situations, and we should revert to good decision-making processes rather than popular ones.

THERE IS NO EFFECTIVE LINKAGE TO THE AUCKLAND PLAN 2050

The consultation document should be, but is not, driven by the Auckland Plan 2050 and on delivering its 6 Outcomes, 20 Strategic directions and 37 Focus areas. The significant major issues identified in council's "2023 Update of the Auckland Plan 2050" should be linked to, and a key driver of the consultation document as they require additional effort and resources/money to be directed to those identified areas.

E.G. The first statement/purpose of the Council's 2022/23 annual report talks about "how we contributed to the Auckland Plan outcomes". This LTP consultation document decision making process should adopt a similar approach noting the serious issues of the 2023 Auckland Plan update.

Specifically, the document should address the key issue facing Auckland as on page 20 of the Auckland Plan 2050 – "Two Speed Auckland" as amplified in the 2023 review of performance. Specifically, this includes reducing what the Auckland Plan describes as "the divide between the rich and the poor". This will presumably require money to address.

All Council decisions should be aligned with, and linked to, the Auckland Plan 2050. Failure to link expenditure to the Outcomes covered in the Plan and its three-year review, make the Auckland Plan a pointless document.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

See 6B response



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

I am drawn to comments as I have been staggered at the lack of investment in Mairangi Bay SLS Club facilities. Drowning rates in NZ are the worst in the world, and it is clear that 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



#8191



SMS clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively - this is the situation right now with Mairangi Bay - a massive provider of Surf Life savers to the AUckland region.

- 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?

I don't know



#8191



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#8191



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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8191



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?



#8191



8. Do you have any other comments?

Further comments in support of SLS in Auckland.

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.

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.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better roads and transport services

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycleways



#8194



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I agree we need better services like busses. I agree to spend less on cycleways because no one uses them and it's a waste of money.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Busses and transport

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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We need that stadium for the North Shore community. It's the only stadium we have and we use it for rugby.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#8194



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

No

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#8194



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8194



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8194



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

We need good transport in the bays.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good, we need to keep our beaches clean.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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 town centre improvements, more bike lanes, more buses, more options to get around (something other than cars) more walkable streets, better/safer bike connections, more safe and secure (locky docks) at bus stations and everywhere



#8196



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

i am ok if you reduce rubbish collection to every secound week -as long as this come with waste minimisation, such as better compost/recycling. and options for people to drop off

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Its great so support more frequent buses. It would be amazing to be able to safety bike to more places.

Bike lanes have such great return on investment, are good for health reasons, help fight climate change, and resilient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

BIKE LANES - more of these, it should be the default that i can bike somewhere safely.

More safer speed zones

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

less on widening roads - instead spend that money on giving people options to get around

Dont bother with a dedicated bike ferry- this is not a viable alternative - liberate a lane on the bridge instead

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct,Change the operational management

Tell us why:



#8196



This could be a great asset for the community - link it up better to the bus station - have more events

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

It is a great idea to have more revenue for the council that is not reliant on rates. It is of benefit to aucklanders to have shares in this

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

its would be nice to have more public access and use of this prime realestate

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Council services are very important

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#8196



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:

as long as there is still enough space for the port to operate safely - we also need to get things in and out - and dont want more trucks on our roads

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to	Support



#8196



reduce the 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.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have 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 the need to consult on minor improvements to bus timetables

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#8196



Hibiscus and Bays

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 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



#8196



Tell us why

Please make it so that we have more options to get around our area - bikes, buses and walking all need more investments

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cycleways for transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8198



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use, but want to see more cycleways as an alternative

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?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It exists, it's close enough to the bus network, it should be used more PROVIDED there are enough events needing 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Council should have a stake in the way the Port and Airport operate. Especially so better rail connections to both can be negotiated. Both are income generating so should be retained.



#8198



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Retain assets

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 needs more space, keeps more trucks off the road. There is enough good public space at Silo Park, Wynyard and Quay Street Waterfront

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#8198



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#8198



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Rates funded refuse collection will discourage waste minimisation. Pay as you throw makes people more aware.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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
--	------------------



#8198



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Protect environment, build more connected cycleways and public 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?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop funding Ethnic & Gender based parades and/or festivals.

Stop producing 77 page proposals.



#8199



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Use 10 seater buses or vans for feeder routes outside of rush hours.

Turn on the Dynamic Lane inbound on Whangaparaoa Rd at 2.30 or 3pm.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Expand the Gulf Harbour ferry to cover weekends,

Security or bus inspectors on outer routes.

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 we do not know how the surrounds of the stadium are used, apart from use by our Football community, this is an incomplete question. How is the Stadium operated? Are they able or allowed to look for outside business?

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:



#8199



Do you want to lose control of the gateway to our city? One presumes we currently have some say in its management.

What are the shares worth?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Since it is operating at a profit, or should be, then those profits are available to fund initiatives and ACC can control how the land, wharves etc are used.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Like our puia maunga, that have to be visible so should our Waitemata. Leave our wharves doing what they need to do, with out blocking them up with apartments and offices.



#8199



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

But make it a welcoming area for visitors as well.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support



#8199



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#8199



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Took awhile to find them.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
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.



#8205



· 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.

Support Mairangi bay surf lifesaving club new build. It's an important community club producing lifeguards, teaching young ones about the environment, coastal risks, water safety, volunteerism/service to others, sport,, values and principles. The club is inaccessible to people with disabilities and injuries and no longer fit for purpose.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop allowing so much high density building which is putting pressure on infrastructure, which then breaks down and requires so much money to fix.

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?



#8205



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#8205

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#8205



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#8205



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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
Continue to support activities 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?



#8205



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.



#8214



- 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)?



#8214



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	
---	--



#8214



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8214



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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?



#8214



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	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.



#8214



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#8225



- 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)?



#8225



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.



#8225



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8225



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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



#8225



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.	

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.”



#8225



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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.



#8256



- 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)?



#8256



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	
---	--



#8256



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8256



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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.



#8257



- 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)?



#8257



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	
---	--



#8257



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8257



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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	
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.



#8260



- 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)?



#8260



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	
---	--



#8260



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8260



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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): Queer coasties

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

A complete assessment of Auckland Council staff, there have been allot of stupid decisions made and the system needs a clean and some staff members need letting go. Your transport system is also appalling and there needs to be more compassion



#8266



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Waisting money on pavements and roads that arent broken , fix things that need fixing only. And by less pointless sculptures that are so plain and bland there just not good enough for public art.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need a better public transport system. We should really consider trains more.... its not for no reason there all over Europe.

We NEED CHEAPER FARES FOR STUDENT'S!!!

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nicer drivers that care

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The level of service you currently offer

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Space 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)?



#8266



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

You need more cash to act

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

You need funds

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

You need to plan ahead of the game and realise what situations we will have to deal with and steer the country in the right direction

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Help our communities grow and thrive

Help us unite and be strong and let us create our own future . Most of all compassion is something to use and hold to, not to abandon and ignore

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#8266



No change – leave Captain Cook 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:

Better transport. Stop funnelling everyone into one option

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support



#8266



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#8266



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.	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 our reserves



#8266



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think its not practical and your not spending the little you get wisely

8. Do you have any other comments?

Listen , talk and repeat until you can comfortably say our future is a future we ALL 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?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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.



#8267



- 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:

We need something on the shore



#8267



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

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:



#8267

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#8267



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 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



#8267



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 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



#8267



“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	Do less
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?

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 scraps bins



#8281



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Why no mention of ferry services we are a waterfront city. Other major cities have frequent and efficient ferry services.

Also most major cities have a rapid transport link between CBD and the Airport .

Use a transfer system where one fare gets you from A to B via different modes of public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

City Rail , especially to AKL airport.

Ferry services

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

some raised pedestrian crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#8281



Tell us why:

Don't like As the objectives for the fund would involve diversifying risk by spreading the fund across a range of investments, it is almost certain that most, if not all, of the AIAL shares would be sold 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

Tell us 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:

Makes sense to me.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Perhaps we could get a sports stadium/concert venue there with access to public transport.



#8281



WLG has the right idea.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support



#8281



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#8281



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not sure



#8281



8. Do you have any other comments?

More funding for Estuary Art's Centre and Centerway theatre. Bring back a proper council office instead of making the Library do the job.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

More control and commitment on the developers. They are abusing the whole system, and their incompetency and/or deficiency. They load the Auckland council all expenses of their shortfall's projects.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8289



See 1c first> Developers should sign on what they build or do for 10, 15 , and 20 years , each stage with list of commitments. Currently, for example, Tempelton is urbanizing LONG BAY, with foreseeable future problems, for example the very narrow streets and roundabouts that the bus should pass over to turn. Also, He is occupying the narrow streets he develops with oversized citizens to live in the tens of the boxes he is building. Traffic jams already happening, and he continues with green light without any future vision of what is Council will pay to rectify the mess he is doing.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It is good, but cycling projects should keep going, pedestrian crossing should not very near to the roundabouts. This makes it very difficult to manage for car drivers.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The costly pedestrian crossings. They key point is the location of these crossings not their design.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Population is expanding, and it eases moves

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#8289



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

It is an important asset, and managing projects more efficiently can compensate, Main Parks for exm[le may be accessed with fees (configurable with one or two dollars)

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

more 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:

My best guess, I need more info to judge indeed

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#8289



Tell us why:

efficient

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

self explanatory

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know



#8289



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#8289



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.	I don't know
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why



#8289



It is a new area, and it should be the model of the future development of other parts of the city which suffers sometimes a lot because of accumulated legacy

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?

Local recreation place and activities in Long bay



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?



#8318



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:



#8318



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#8318



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#8318



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Not Important



#8318



options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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?



#8327



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:

needs to be used more and generate more opportunity for the shore

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

is using the assets value to make a better 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:



#8327



stick to your knitting, very likely a private will manage better. Can bank on the lease as an income so easier to budget with less risk.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#8327



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#8327



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Fairly Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Fairly Important



#8327



Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	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?

Appears more maintenance and Nothing to ground breaking that makes good general new improved impact

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?



#8330



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:

Surely this venue could be used by many community groups and also a concert venue?

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Potential to earn money from a major asset costing money!!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#8330



Again a valuable asset costing money when more could be gained from leasing

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#8330



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#8330



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?

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.



#8334



- 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:



#8334



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#8334

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8334



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#8334



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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?



#8334



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	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?



#8341



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?



#8341



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#8341



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8341



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Not Important



#8341



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	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?

Protecting the environment.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8349



Reduced support for larger events, which should be based on a market economy, rather than councils taking money to support them.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Crosswalks and bike lanes don't need to be retrofitted, Oakland's population density simply doesn't warrant retrofitting crosswalks, traffic lights could be added in some of the more densely populated neighborhoods, and bike lane retrofits are completely unnecessary.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Pedestrian crosswalk and bike lane improvements

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:



#8349



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#8349



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8349



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#8349



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	
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?

Yes there is. The amount of rubbish sitting on the sides of the roads and near on ramps to motorways and along motorways is disgusting. I hate to think what tourists to our city think about the state of cleanliness in our city. It is so embarrassing. This needs to be attended to urgently.



#8402



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No in my opinion they need to do more. Trees that used to be pruned regularly are not touched now. They look ugly, some are dead as well. There should be a regular maintenance of the trees in Auckland and on the properties that the Council is meant to maintain. Ie in on properties where they do the lawns etc but the buildings are looked after by others.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because you are never going to get the majority of people out of their cars. Time is precious and if you have to wait around for a bus it just doesn't work. I am retired but do occasional gardening jobs. There is no way I could use public transport to get to these jobs. You have to be realistic. Years ago we should have had a metro built which would go all over Auckland in speed and was very efficient. Unfortunately we have left it too late for Auckland.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Yes definitely. Decent contractors who do maintenance properly instead of mowing motorway sides and leaving parts not mown, leaving roundabouts looking disgusting. I know AT are meant to do some of them, well that's a joke. They do them eventually by which time you cannot see the exits or onramps. You should never have taken the quote of the new contractors. They are a disaster.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes event spending. Is it necessary to have all the events that Council is involved in.

To me it is a luxury that we can no longer afford. Trim those down to absolute necessary ones.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#8402



Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is a valuable place for events on the North Shore of which we dont have many.

It must be kept but maybe new operators should be found.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#8402



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know



#8402



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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



#8402



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

Tell us why



#8402



7c. What 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 do think they do an amazing job and should be supported as much as possible.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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 more spending money on unnecessary things. people are already suffering. we wish you not adding any more living cost to people.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8415



I don't want to pay anymore tax on top of what we are already paying.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We are already in recession.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everything

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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?



#8415



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#8415



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8415



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Sort the motorways - Devonport bypass Lake Road from Bayswater to AK Harbour Bridge - South Auckland. Needs another motorway link to the city,

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8425



Judder bars and crossings remove them, road closure, road cones, traffic management.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

User pays

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Harbour Crossing

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

EVs

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 the people on the North Shore fought way too hard for that asset, bring back the concerts, games, more shows. It's a disgrace. Leave it alone.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#8425



We need change to survive. The city doesn't need to grow, it needs to run efficiently with a reliable infrastructure. Stop this rates runaway nonsense. Imagine a business operating like this, 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:

Supports the infrastructure

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Redundant wharfs

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#8425



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

To prevent conversion of the asset into apartments or hotels, expo, possible pool, cultural centre or operate a bigger cruise ship terminal independently.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know



#8425



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Remove the RMA, internal taxes and interest. If KiwiSaver works so well then why could the council run a similar operation. Is it Agenda 20/30? I was there it was a disgrace.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#8425



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

At least there is some direction, purpose and focus. The climate change nonsense has to stop with the global narrative. Stop taxing the ***** out of the economy by false pretenses, it's fake.



#8425



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Just get on with it. Make Auckland great again. We can do it.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?



#8441



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need light rail connecting both north and south, you should be able to climb on a train in the north shore and take it all the way to the CBD

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport and railways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Highways, we don't need more lanes. Build light rail

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:

Fund seems short sighted and an overly complicated way of transferring public money into private hands to enrich a few and for public to loose more ownership of public services and lands



#8441



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Giving public services such as the port or public transport leads to worse outcomes as the private enterprises cut corners in order to get more profits out and then turn to the public and demand a bailout when the infrastructure starts to fall apart and they need more money to fix problems caused by their negligence and cost cutting.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 just seems like a way to hand over public money to private interests

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know



#8441



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#8441



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#8441



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	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	
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?

Looking after indigenous trees

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8451



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?

Purchase of some smaller size buses [electric]

2b. 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:

To make this asset more useful for Northshore

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 and the Port are important assets that future generations have rights to

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8451



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Use dividends to improve the waterfront area for people to use

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

So called future fund 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:



#8451



Long term our Harbour must be an improved asset

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#8451



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
---	--



#8451



Support 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	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8452



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?



#8452



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#8452



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8452



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

This questionnaire needs to use plainer language. The questions and answers to choose are needlessly wordy and convoluted. I'm well educated but had difficulty properly understanding what the options were in bulleted answers. I'm sure many wouldn't understand the content.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	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?



#8456



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways could mean less people using private vehicles, which is surely what we would like to improve upon.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Once the stadium goes, it will be lost forever and North Shore has no other local amenity like this. Make it user friendly for all, and available to many.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 little percentage Auckland owns, will then no doubt be in foreign hands if sold.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#8456



Tell us 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:

No doubt council services will be reduced continuously, this may help to keep to key aspects.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#8456



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8456



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8456



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?

As good as could be with current restrictions.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Review what councils were originally established to do and focus on those core services - ie rates rise year on year while basic services diminish. Our roads are appalling. Rubbish collection is user-pay. Infrastructure maintenance is being collected on but not used for purpose, etc etc



#8490



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop investing in expensive shiny "nice to have" events and venues. Focus on building quality infrastructure and quality base services - things that as rate payers should be getting from the huge amount of annual revenue being collected from individuals.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop all projects that interfere with people travelling. In Auckland people are travelling to work across many suburbs every day. The public transport system will cost billions to make it a viable and safe and convenient option for the majority of people. As an example, I always worked 9-11 hour days and to use public transport would have added 3 hours or more to my travel time. In addition, I would have had to still drive to a transport hub and park all day in areas that were not secure. And in Winter this would have included walking in the dark on my own. So it was never going to be an option for me.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Quality roads that adequately cater for peak traffic periods. Reduce surface water on high traffic roads (motorways). Install safety barriers on higher speed roads. A maintenance cycle to prevent major problems. Address ground security on major access roads where erosion and slips are issues.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Ridiculous initiatives around 'reducing or calming traffic' that create new problems - thinking long term about ALL the impacts of decisions. Signage needs to be in a language that 95% of our population understands. We can be safer without slowing us down. So much money has been wasted on non-viable, decisions that were never agreed to by the people that pay for them.



#8490



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Invest into creating a sustainable and flexible complex for multi-purpose use and enjoyment by the wider community. Turn it into a viable self-funding business while ensuring it provides for what people want in such a venue.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I believe this is a short-term financial gain and it is never a good idea to sell assets and use capital. The return on the investment needs to be maximised and the capital preserved.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

As in previous, retain the capital investment and interest in the asset. I understand the need to free capital which is why I selected this option. I would still have concerns about how and who this would be leased to and how the council would ensure a high level of governance in the management.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#8490



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

We have a shortfall in basic council services that need to continue to meet the expectations of ratepayers.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

It is imperative in our current economic climate to cease investing bulk capital into new ventures. Focus on maintaining and improving what we have.

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



#8490



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Do not support



#8490



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

A full review of how rates are collected and then allocated. ie I have tank water plus town-to-tank installed as a back-up and to water my garden. My water bill (for a single person on tank) was over \$60 last month, yet only \$11 of that was for actual water used (town supply). All of the balance was fixed fees and waste water. This is out of control. And even more astonishing when we read about all the water/wastewater infrastructural issues around the city. Those fixed fees are a total rip off if the are funding anything other than water infrastructure maintenance as charged.

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	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?

Don't fund any events directly (Polyfest, Santa Parade, Lantern Festival etc). Instead allow the relevant organisers to use the space for free. Help/waive any consents but don't contribute financially.



#8493



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We should allow cyclists to use footpaths in more areas. Footpaths are under utilised outside of school hours and cycle lanes are comparatively expensive.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

The stadium is under utilised and we have enough venues that are easy to get to overall.

We do need to keep developing more leisure centres and parks as the city grows. I can see the strain on resources at my local council leisure centre as the area has grown rapidly over the past five 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:

We are (and were) a major shareholder in the Airport and didn't even have a seat on the board. We have under utilised our shareholding and it has led to conflicts of



#8493



interest when it comes to opportunities for a second Airport. A future fund is more appropriate than not being engaged shareholders in such a major asset. If we keep Airport shares we need to proactively be more involved.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

On the face of it I prefer to lease the port but the devil is in the detail of the conditions. We should protect employees, expect high health and safety standards and make sure our rates savings are not just transferred into increased freight costs.

In the long term we should consider moving the port and possibly having strong rail links to Whangarei to get trucks off roads etc but that will require central Govt support and isn't Aucklands problem to solve alone.

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:

Can we also sell Eden Park or rip the bandaid off and let it do concerts etc.

If we replace it with a waterfront stadium it should be privately owned. Council can promise a smooth/prioritised consenting process. The All Blacks can build it?

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#8493



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 we don't even know what the benefit is I'm not confident we should do the change. Until you can articulate the alternative leave it alone. Leasehold retail buildings would likely be a hit though.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

If we don't even know what the benefit is I'm not confident we should do the change. Until you can articulate the alternative leave it alone.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support



#8493



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Not supportive of the council taking over refuse. We have perfectly competent private operators that offer a wonderful service.



#8493



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.	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.	Not Important



#8493



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 have a limited number of reserves in a fast growing area. Don't sell them, make sure they can be properly utilised.

A lot of houses on Vipond road (and other areas) have also fenced in land owned by council. It might be worth making decisions on selling or reclaiming that kind of land?

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.

I don't know

Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.

I don't know



#8493



Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	I don't know
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	I don't know
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	I don't know
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

1b. 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.



#8498



- 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)?



#8498



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



#8498



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8498



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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?



#8498



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.”



#8498



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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.



#8499



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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#8499



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



#8499



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8499



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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 less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

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.



#8519



- 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:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#8519



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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?



#8519



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8519



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

· 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



#8519



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	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.”



#8519



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	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Anything that protects the native wildlife and works towards climate change goals..

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop internal restructuring.



#8537



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?



#8537



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#8537



businesses and raises the share paid 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 .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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.



#8549



- 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?

Road maintenance

2b. 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:



#8549



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:



#8549



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support



#8549



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 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.



#8549



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know



#8549



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?

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



#8549



Continue to support activities 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?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport less car centric plans

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less departments



#8551



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:

Brings money to Albany 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:

It is important and should not be private.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#8551



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This	Support
---	---------



#8551



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#8551



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Other

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do 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?

Better transport. Cleaner streets.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Compost local bins- Waste!



#8552



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

cycleways are safe

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

bus + train infrastructure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Huge local economic boost.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Private ownership could lead to negative changes being made with less opposition.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8552



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Good cash flow increase + land ownership retained

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Fund needs money

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#8552

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8552



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#8552



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?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do more
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?

-

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8569



-

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?

Subsidising public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

More events for locals

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#8569



Tell us 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:

Use for public events.

6a. What do you 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
---	---------



#8569



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#8569



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.



#8569



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

Tell us why

-

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

-

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	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?

Transport!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8603



Cultural things while important are less important. This does not mean getting rid of cultural events as they are a crucial part of the community but just discovering more creative ways to support this sector.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Yes absolutely but other things also need more focus.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The North Shore stadium has so much more potential for the community. Making it bigger can also increase New Zealand's overall income as more and more people and artists are attracted to New Zealand.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

This is good to plan for the future, but it's important to consider the PRESENT as well.



#8603



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#8603



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8603



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our 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



#8603



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

Yes community is important but making sure our enviroment is safe and well is more of a priority to me.

7c. What 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	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?

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.



#8605



- 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?

No

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

They are good plans.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#8605



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:



#8605



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support



#8605



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?



#8605



Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki

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.	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



#8605



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Very Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Fairly Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Not Important



#8605



Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Not Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#8610



- 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)?



#8610



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



#8610



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#8610



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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?



#8610



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.”



#8610



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	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?

Support most of the proposal



#8632



Tell us why:

Improvement of the public transport infrastructure. Reduction in the push to get people out of their cars and increase the requirement for residential parking by developers.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Give us a quality public transport system we can rely on.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Once this asset is sold off we will never have it back. Eden Park is not enough to service the needs of greater Auckland.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Once the asset is gone we lose the income stream.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#8632



Tell us here:

Keep the potential revenue generating asset!

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Council to find a balance between rate increases and improved 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:

Unsure if taking them from Ports allows for a practical Ports operation.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

as above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#8632



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8632



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8632



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

Feedback from the community is crucial as we are the ones who likely know our community needs.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I have faith in our Local Board

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do 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?

More parks and access to community activity centres for kids

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8634



Stop increasing rates so much. It's getting ridiculous and we are now looking at moving out of Auckland seriously. Over 4.5 thousand dollars a year we pay for rates. Increasing them is rubbish

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

You need to focus on the roads promised before covid came and gave you all an excuse to remove the planned proposals for them.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Glenvar road, filling in potholes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Buses and transport lanes when car lanes are required

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Sell 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:



#8634



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

Too expensive to change

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:



#8634

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8634



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8634



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?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	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?



#8639



No

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make public transport a lot better for students

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Doesn't get used a lot and could be used more for the community

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

Don't give to international investors



#8639



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

Auckland needs to improve

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#8639

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Other
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8639



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
---	--



#8639



Support 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

(illegible)

7c. What 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 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?



#8671



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

To be a first class city we need a strong reliable public network system that delivers to residents and visitors alike.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Better integrations, more frequency

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:

North Shore needs a sports/entertainment hub. Fix whatever is wrong with the model but do not demolish the stadium and redevelop.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 assets

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8671



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Better management and closer ties will keep the assets

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#8671



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8671



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	I don't know
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8671



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 less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8692



stop wasting money on road works i drive around auckland every day and there is far too many road blocks / traffic management in place. Who on the council is getting the back hander for building these raised crossings

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

sick to death of your roadworks.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

get rid of the t2 lanes they arent working

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

t2 lanes public transport raised crossings traffic management

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:



#8692



its an asset that is making 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:

another asset that should be making good money for the rate payer start running it better so we can get better profits

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#8692

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8692



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8702



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:

Firstly, an indoor stadium on the North Shore is desperately needed, like West Auckland (Trust Stadium) and South Auckland (Bruce Pullman). The North Shore population is growing massively, especially the younger generation, and facilities for indoor sports such as basketball and pickleball are desperately needed.

Secondly, the North Harbour Stadium site could be re-jigged to include covered outdoor courts for sports such as pickleball. Pickleball is a young sport in NZ but is the fastest growing sport in the world. It started here for the older age group but is now played by all age groups (eg the Australasia Pacific Pro League now has 2 NZ teams, and the Auckland event will be held at Albany Tennis Park in late March). Currently we use courts in Council/school/YMCA gymnasiums, and some outdoor courts on existing public tennis courts. In Auckland there is too much rain for uncovered outdoor courts to be a realistic option.

Pickleball has exhausted all the indoor facilities available. On the North Shore we have grown from 2 sessions per week to 7 at the Council's Browns Bay Leisure Centre, but are unable to get more time, particularly after work or on weekends, because of use by other activities. Our open sessions are getting up to 46 players (we have 4 courts) which is really frustrating as you only get 2-3 15 minute games during the whole session with a lot of waiting going on. Every new session we introduce, the number of players just goes mad. Currently we also aren't able to accommodate school aged players because we just can't get enough courts. Typically pickleball players each pay \$5 to \$10 to play at a 2-3 hour open session. Additionally, players can book private sessions.



#8702



The Albany Tennis Centre has time for pickleball sessions twice per week only. They also host pickleball tournaments twice per year (which have grown from an 8 court tournament to 23 courts this April). At Kumeu Racquets Club, pickleball is now the most popular sport and runs the most sessions.

The facilities at other towns around New Zealand are phenomenal- Mt Maunganui has a gymnasium with 16 pickleball courts; Wellington and South Auckland also have excellent facilities.

So, if you could build a minimum of 8, preferably 12-16, covered pickleball courts at North Harbour Stadium (they don't have to be indoor, just covered and with lighting, like the covered outdoor netball/tennis courts at Westlake Girls High, so we can play in all weather and at night) I know we would be able to run day/night/weekend sessions that would be extremely popular, and be able to include school aged players

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:

A 35 year lease just delays fixing the actual problem

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:



#8702



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	I don't know



#8702



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8702



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#8702



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	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?



#8711



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The cost should not be that high.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#8711



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#8711



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support



#8711



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	
Water	
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
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?



#8738



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#8738



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#8738



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8738



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	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.	



#8738



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	
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.



#8760



- 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)?



#8760



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.



#8760



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8760



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have 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?

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	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?

Better public transport

Better walking and cycling infrastructure

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8770



Allowing people to park on road for free. Charge people for storing personal property on public land.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need more cycling infrastructure

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycling and walking infrastructure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Dynamic lanes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Selling off assets only provides short term gain unless proceeds are invested in major infrastructure



#8770



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:



#8770

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8770



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8770



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?

Sewerage leakage on North Shore coast

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8771



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:

Control by people aware of local needs & desires.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Giving away AKI assets to be managed by professionals who are not accountable to ratepayer opinion is a problem. If it's the same as Auckland Transport then for me a definite no.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#8771



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#8771



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#8771



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important



#8771



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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	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?

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.



#8780



- 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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:



#8780



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#8780



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#8780



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#8780



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.	Very Important

Tell us why



#8780



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
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.



#8787



- 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)?



#8787



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.



#8787



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8787



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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

Fairly Important



#8787



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.	
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.”



#8787



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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.



#8801



- 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)?



#8801



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.



#8801



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#8801



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have 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 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	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#8801



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

“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.”



#8801



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8836



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#8836



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#8836



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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



#8836



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#8836



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	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?

Auckland City desperately needs more public transport and active transport funding. For decades, this has gone underinvested, resulting in a public transport network that lags far behind what the city needs. Regardless of whether the government wants to



#8857



fund it, Auckland Council should start work on a surface-level light rail network from the city centre to the airport, to west Auckland and to the north shore.

The city also desperately needs to face the climate crisis head-on and should put more funding towards both decarbonising the city (the aforementioned PT investment will help here) but also into adaption.

1d. Is there anything else 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 support the planned public transport investments in the pay more option, the \$50 cap is a great idea. However, council should not roll back funding for cycleways or pedestrian crossings, we need to encourage and increase active transport usage.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Active transport and rail need more investments than what was mentioned in the plan.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Transport spending is already far too lopsided in favour of road/ car infrastructure. With the exception of safety improvements, car-based infrastructure investment should be minimal.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#8857



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Privatisation of the city's strategic assets is a terrible idea, and an unproven fund is not a good enough justification for doing so.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Democratic control of both the Airport and ports will be vital in coming decades and they should not be sold off to private corporations.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#8857



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support



#8857



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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



#8857



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8863



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Would prefer more focus on improving public transport to provide effective alternatives to driving. Such as ensuring busses have priority for faster and more reliable journey times.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Bus priority

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, Other

Tell us why:

Underutilised but shouldn't be. Good location & access, relatively new, large population on the north shore. Seems like it could be managed better to increase attendance, and revenue.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8863



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

unclear what the financial benefits may be if the wharf were removed from port operations



#8863

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8863



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#8863



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?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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.



#8889



- 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:



#8889



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#8889



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#8889



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 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



#8889



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



#8889



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 more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#8927



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#8927



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#8927



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#8927



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Not Important



#8927



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?

Reduce cultural and art spend. Get the basics right and focus budget on this. Hie.
Solve waste water/storm water contamination during rain events.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
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.



#8955



- 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)?



#8955



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:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This	
---	--



#8955



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#8955



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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?



#8955



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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?



#8955



“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	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?

Cycle lanes

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8997



Get rid of food scraps bins

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't stop the cycle initiatives - the hard work is done now in some areas just needs to be connected like any network it works best when it's connected together

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycling

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cultural junk

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Needs more events

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Future



#8997



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#8997



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#8997



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who 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



#8997



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

complete cycle lanes

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	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	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 the rubbish bins. Move the green areas more.

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



#9006



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.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less road works.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less, bus lanes e.g. east coast road, one bus every 10mins. Make it a t2 at least.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rubbish bins. People can't help themselves but to litter.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#9006



Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#9006



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support



#9006



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#9006



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.	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



#9006



7c. What 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?

sort Infrastructure and put in place rules so property owners have to take more responsibility for maintenance of their property, so neighboring properties are not impacted.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9078



Stop wasting money on public transport that's not making a difference.

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:

Fresh management could bring better use of the stadium and could get more income and use from it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#9078



Tell us 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:

to help reduce costs to everyday house hold as in rates increases

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Other



#9078



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#9078



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	I don't know



#9078



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 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?



#9117



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:

Cricket venue would be great

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The shares were free they are providing income and should not be sold.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#9117



Tell us here:

A 35 year lease would increase the cost of everything that arrives in NZ through the port since they would want to make a large profit to cover costs

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:

Area needed for 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

Support



#9117



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#9117



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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.	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



#9117



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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	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.



#9119



- 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)?



#9119



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.



#9119



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#9119



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have 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 less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do 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 their house in order to many people being paid to much

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cut the management levels



#9144



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because AT and the council doesn't have a clue how to run the transport system now, it would be a waste of money, it is run by a bunch of idiots

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

What the council needs is to stick to the core objectives

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes cut the levels of high paid staff,

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Because it is run by idiots at the moment,

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Good way of raising money



#9144



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Hopefully it will get 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:

We need to keep Auckland looking smart, stick to the core business.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Stop wasting money, by not doing this

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#9144

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9144



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

What ever people say,Auckland council is just paying lip service to the people

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9144



Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?



#9154



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

North Harbour Stadium has hosted world class events as well as local sports teams. It is important to the community to have this venue and it should not be re-developed. If it is not functioning as intended, a change in operational management is the best option.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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



#9154



Tell us 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



#9154



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#9154



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	Fairly Important



#9154



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

I would like to see a bit more focus on the environment, but good to see water quality is a priority. Having safe path networks is also really important, especially for children and families.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I agree with them in general, but allot of them sit outside the local board decision making process and are more around advocacy. I would like some more focus around priorities they can control.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?

Get rid of the Port from Auckland City landscape completely within 5-10 years! Move it to the Manukau Harbour no matter what engineering it takes. Use public / private partnership to develop a world class city as Sydney Australia has done with beautiful expansive walkways / cycle ways linking the City to Tamaki Drive. This should be the main focus for Auckland's future pride and prosperity. Do not go down the lease path



#9185



and tie Auckland into keeping the Port where it is for the next 30 years! What a disaster that would be. It's like having a dump as your neighbour but arguing that as long as it delivers a profit then who cares. It's on prime development land and MUST go. That's the only reason Wayne Brown was voted in for goodness sake!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Wind back the years and stick to the core council roles involving essential services. Then be ruthless in cutting roles around the edges involving non measurable services like small community events, various cultural groups and selecting the most expensive sites to run council services. Stop trying to do bits of everything and focus on what really matters for the best possible cost.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

The sooner the Hop card goes the better and the capped payment works well in Sydney Australia. The bus lanes need to take priority at congestion points e.g. Lake Road Takapuna just before Esmonde Road. Scooters should be able to use the residential bus lanes to reduce cars going to the city and provide a 'safe journey' away from cars.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Get the cycle way from the City to Takapuna

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:



#9185



If you actually build a downtown waterfront stadium then North Harbour could go BUT if there is no waterfront stadium then keep North Harbour and reduce the costs to users. Perhaps lease the stadium for 10 years and let a private company run events and concerts from there. That way ownership is maintained with no cost to council. BUILD the sunken waterfront stadium next to Britomart Train Station and the Ferry terminals!!!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 need to be retained - for now. Fix the finances through other means and cost cutting council salaries and staff

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

The number one priority for Auckland should be to move Port from it's current location!! It lacks any vision to even contemplate retaining the Port where it is now. Move it to Manukau Harbour and free up the absolute prime downtown land for public/private partnership development to make Auckland a truly desirable international destination. Increased tourism long term and the share beautification of Auckland will well and truly cover the lost revenue from leasing the Port for 35 long years! This is the councils moment to transform Auckland and New Zealand. Stop procrastinating and just get on with it. There have been many beautiful concepts for 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?



#9185



Other

Tell us here:

Just move the Port. The pleasure it would give Auckland residents and tourists having it gone from this prime location far outweighs and income it may potentially bring. It's location is ruining Auckland's future prosperity. Move 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:

Move but this is at least a start the whole Port. Great spot for a sunken stadium!

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Move much quicker than 15 years! Build the covered Stadium here within 5 years.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by



#9185



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#9185



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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	Not Important



#9185



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?

Move the Port completely from downtown Auckland with urgency - 5 years. Build a magnificent downtown covered stadium next to the bus/train and ferry services. Provide a 'safe traffic lane' for bikes/scooters from Takapuna (with other area connects) to Downtown Auckland. Seek more funding from Govt via IRD or GST takings.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?

more bicycle and pedestrian options on the roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

maintaining roads for cars



#9208



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?

make streets more livable

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:

keep airport and port in council assesses

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other



#9208



Tell us here:

retain port and lease it out

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#9208



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#9208



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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.	Fairly Important



#9208



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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	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?

like randomly changing what goes into the recycle bins? please no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less people better processes



#9238



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

even with post-covid working from home traffic is an issue that can easily be resolved with proper public transport which Auckland currently does not have

2a. Is there anything you 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:

why is obvious, how about you improve its appeal and try to attract more events

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#9238



Tell us here:

the information here does not provide how much money the port does currently with the current arrangements. I'm not gonna read the whole document so I don't know if that is a wise divestment or not.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

there are enough buildings and facilities in that area to not justify this

5b. What option do you prefer 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
---	---------



#9238



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#9238



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important



#9238



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

If AT is also under AC management I think you need to work with police to increase security in public transport stops and vehicles.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
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.



#9253



- 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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:



#9253



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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?



#9253



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#9253



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#9253



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.”

- With regard to Question 7c:



#9253



"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?

"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.

We request that the Auckland council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the long term plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf



#9273



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 of 150 active lifeguards, over 500 junior Surf children aged 6-14years and a further 600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership - 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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

- it has a great location - it close to transport links and should be upgraded so It can be used more often.



#9273



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9273



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#9273



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Re question 1c Auckland City Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is need most - surf life saving facilities are a critical component of our community. they have served 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 70 people in the Auckland anniversary floods and so so operating out of storage shiipping 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



#9273



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	
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 Mairangi Bay reserve management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf lifesaving club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year



#9273



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	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?

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.



#9281



- 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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#9281



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

Tell us why:



#9281



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#9281



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#9281



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.”



#9281



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	
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?

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.



#9300



- 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?

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.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?



#9300



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#9300



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#9300



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	
--	--



#9300



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
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.”

· With regard to Question 7c:

“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.



#9300



7c. What 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	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?

Expanding the cycling network with inexpensive connections, particularly to public transport, including "Live Lightly", "Making space for water". More tree planting.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9305



Scale back some support for festivals.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improving public transport and provision for walking and cycling is the only way to reduce congestion.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A connected, inexpensive cycling network - not grand projects - with good links to public transport. Low traffic neighbourhoods. Remove parking on major arterials like Dominion road to create 24 hour bus only lanes (which can easily be converted to surface light rail when required).

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Parking

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:



#9305



Selling capital assets to cover running costs does not seem to be a good idea, although consolidating assets and trying to maximise returns sounds good.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#9305

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9305



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who 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



#9305



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?

Support: "continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well connected networks for active modes of transport" and also support retention of the Gulf Harbour ferry.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycle lanes.



#9313



Raised pedestrian crossings.

Re-asphalting of roads with minor needs. Halve the projects to Fultan Hogan.

Reduce cost of Traffic Management at works sites. Too many cones, trucks and workers with minimal results. (over the top).

Defer significant projects by 2 to 3 years and use the savings to pay debt.

Stop selling assets. Keep the port and airport investments.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cut all spending on non-critical transport options. Defer for 2 to 3 years and use savings to pay debt.

Forego matching funds from central government. We are living beyond our means. Time to start living within our means at steady rates indexed to resitent baseline.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Flood protection.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle lanes.

Raised pedestrian crossings.

Deep review of all CCOs and their management mindsets to take the extravagance out of their culture.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management



#9313



Tell us why:

This stadium has lots of opportunity for being productive. It is vital to have for NS citizens now and in future as the city grows. Let's get some smarter management running it.

If we disposed of everything that had a period of negative cashflow we would have sold many important holdings.

I have attended many successful events there in the past. Good management can make it valuable again.

I am very much against a new stadium on Auckland CBD waterfront.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Such a fund will be short lived as it will soon be used up to pay debt. Then there will be 'nothing' producing passive income to off-set rates.

It depends on selling assets which I object to.

It might look good today but future Aucklenders will regret it.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

We lose the ability to manage the future of the port. We will be locked in to the leasing company's long term plans.



#9313



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 City gets this land now they will want to develop it resulting in more spending on "Grand" projects. We need the income, not more spending.

Ask the question again in 5 years when the City economy is better and less debt.

5b. What option do you prefer 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

Other



#9313



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#9313



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9313



reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

10 years planning for local issues is a long time. Local issues change a lot within this period and needs to be flexible and not locked in for 10 years.

The City needs to prioritise flood protection. Upgrade culverts and bunds.

We also need to provide accommodation for the needy. We have a civic responsibility for unfortunate people.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Time to cut back on spending. Just because we have a credit line there in no reason to use it. Plan to reduce debt by less spending instead of selling assets.

One day we won't have assets to sell and the Creditors will be dictating our lifestyles. A future at the mercy of lenders will be grim.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do 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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9328



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

No

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Bc

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9328



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Bc

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:

Ok

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#9328



Dd

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#9328



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Snsjksjsk

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements.	I don't know
--	--------------



#9328



Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners.	
Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community.	
Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme.	
Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants.	

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?

Environmental protection

Arts funding

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9408



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycleways should still get funding.

2a. Is there anything you 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 seems under utilised as it currently exists.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#9408



Tell us here:

Thirty five years is too long, needs to be more flexibility for future plans for the waterfront.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

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:

anything that gives the waterfront back for public use has my support. for reasons of city appeal and vibrancy.

5b. What option do you prefer 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, and it's so ugly.



#9408

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9408



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,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.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#9408



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

They are all great things, why wouldn't you want them.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#9408



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

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



#9408



8. Do you have any other comments?

Please continue to support Kumeu Arts Centre



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9440



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#9440



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#9440



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do 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?



#9452



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because I love transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More frequent buses

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:

Because it is old

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Because it is old

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9452



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#9452



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9452



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Fairly Important



#9452



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?

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	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?

Environmental health and public facilities to be more developed

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9458



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Maybe more focus on providing more services

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#9458



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#9458



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#9458



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Papakura, Upper Harbour

Papakura Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Very Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Fairly Important



#9458



We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Fairly Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Very Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate	Fairly Important



#9458



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.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land

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?

Nope :)



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do 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?

Playgrounds

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Taxes



#9469



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It seems like a good decision

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More buses going to./from school

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public buses

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It seems to need a update

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Seems like a good idea

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9469



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

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?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9469



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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



#9469



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9479



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?

the enviroment

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

transport

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

cause i like 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:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9479



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

Idk

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#9479



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9479



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#9479



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?

I think the prorites are good

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nope that all :)



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?

NAH

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

stop making me pay alot



#9486



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

just cus

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

everything

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

its a really cool 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:

cuz

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9486



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

yes

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

CUZ

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

CUZ

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

CUZ

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9486

**Tell us why:**

cuZ

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know



#9486



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

done

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna,Hibiscus and Bays,Upper Harbour

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#9486



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

Tell us why

because

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

i think its not good cuz its expensize

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



#9486



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	I don't know
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	I don't know
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	I don't know
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	I don't know
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

cuZ

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

cuZ



#9486



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 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

Tell us why

cuZ



#9486



7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

yo

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?

cuZ

8. Do you have any other comments?

no



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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



#9499



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#9499



Tell us 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 increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#9499



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#9499



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9501



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think it's good putting more effort into transport as it is a common use nowadays.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Safer transport e.g. buses for higher paying as in less people allowed on instead of overpacking buses.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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



#9501



Tell us 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.

Support



#9501



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#9501



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Very Important



#9501



options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	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?



#9502



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because a lot of people use public transport nowadays.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More bus lines. To have more available opportunities for people to catch buses without it being packed.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#9502



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know



#9502



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#9502



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	Not Important



#9502



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?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do 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?



#9504



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

faster transport is perfect for quicker route to school.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

creating more routes for busses and trains in Auckland.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

traffic control

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

more money can go towards government and for playing fields for sports.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

helping against climate change will be very beneficial.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#9504



Tell us here:

less taxes for citizens.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

help improve the future of auckland

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I do not have any more feedback

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

people need wharves to get in and out of Auckland on boats

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

large vessels and ferries need places to dock to bring people and containers.



#9504

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9504



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

no more feedback

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

no more comments



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	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?

free transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less road works



#9506



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

transport is a big thing and it is used often

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

keeping roads safe and faster

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

nope

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

lots of money and depends how much the stadium is usually used

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

sounds good

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9506



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

leave the port its fine

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

invest in other things

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

lesses taxes

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

do some transferring with halve of port

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9506



Tell us why:

make our city to public

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	



#9506



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

make things cheaper

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?



#9510



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#9510



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#9510



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9510



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9510



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	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?

NOT THAT I CAN THINK OF RIGHT NOW

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9515



MAYBE GENERAL TAXES, BUT IT DOES SEEM TO BE GOING JUST FINE
WITHOUT A CHANGE, BUT IT WOULD BE NICE TO HAVE ONE

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I THINK THIS SEEMS LIKE A GREAT IDEA, BUT I DON'T USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT
AS MUCH AS I SHOULD. FROM WHAT I HAVE HEARD, THIS WOULD BE AN
IMPROVEMENT.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

MAYBE THE QUALITY OF THE VEHICLES

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

NO

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

I THINK THAT IT WOULD BE A LITTLE BIT EXPENSIVE TO UPGRADE IT, BUT IT
COULD BE WORTH IT

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund
and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport
Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



#9515



Tell us why:

THIS SOUNDS LIKE IT WOULD MAKE INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL MUCH EASIER

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

THIS WOULD AGIAN HELP THE TRAVEL TO NZ ISLANDS

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

THIS WOULD HELP THE COMMUNITY IN MY OPINION

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?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

IT MIGHT MAKE CHANGES TO THE WAY PEOPLE BEHAVE



#9515



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#9515



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.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

NO

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

NO



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?



#9526



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)?

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?



#9526



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	I don't know



#9526



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9526



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 less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

democracy

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9528



less money

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

because I love democracy

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

maccas

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

maccas

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

sports

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

because it helps support the greater community



#9528



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 will help imports

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

because of the profit gain per capita

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

make an indoor skatepark

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

because I dont support this

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9528



Tell us why:

opinion

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#9528



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

rates fund release act

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

nah

9528





Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More transport school buses

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less playgrounds



#9532



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think this is reasonable

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More school buses

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:

I don't use 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:

I think this is a good idea

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9532



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Good 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:

So we can have a future fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Good idea

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9532



Tell us why:

I like this

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Other
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other



#9532



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#9532



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.	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

Becuase i live there

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

good

8. Do you have any other comments?

No



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	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?

Medical services should have an increase in pay.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9533



From roadworks across the North Shore, there appears to be a lot of roadworks that isn't needed in order to maintain a safer road.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

making public transport faster along with reducing temporary traffic management sounds very efficient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

-

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

pedestrian crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Do not have a clue on the current state of 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#9533



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

continue the council group operation of the port seems 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:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

wharves sounds efficient for more shipping

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#9533

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9533



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Nope

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Nope



#9536



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because public transport should be more easier and efficient for people.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nope

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nope

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

So that we can use the stadium for more events.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9536



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Because the wharf is a really cool place that runs well. Council could even add more to make the wharf even more popular.

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:



#9536

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#9536



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Nope

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nope.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#9537



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

no

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

no

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9537



I don't know

Tell us here:

no

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

no

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

no

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:



#9537



no

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#9537



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

idk

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Aotea/Great Barrier

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works.	Fairly Important
Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets.	Not Important



#9537



Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide.	Not Important
Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

no

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

idk

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	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?

Library options, arts, sports and a wide range of arts.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no.



#9539



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It is a reasonable proposal with great outcomes of economic impact on both sides, the only part I do don't agree with fully is the idea of stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways..

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Libraries

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:

The stadium is functioning completely although the maintenance is really high and is not being used for the needs of the community as a whole. if it is to be redone the it would only cost a fraction more to redo and it will then be used as intended creating an easier way for the maitanence to be paid.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#9539



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 current council is doing a fantastic job and to change it all now, will effect the proposals.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 will be better for he long term.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

It will beinfiet the public and the money they spend in taxes will not go to waste.



#9539



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support



#9539



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

no.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

no.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9542



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?

I don't know



#9542



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	I don't know



#9542



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9542



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9546



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think public transport has some room for improvement

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

The money could possibly be spent on something else instead

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 not sure

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9546



I don't know

Tell us here:

I'm not sure

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

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:

I'm not sure

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I'm not sure



#9546

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9546



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less carbon emissions



#9547



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think decreasing traffic in Auckland is an important issue to focus on

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improving public transport system

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:

North Harbour Stadium is probably not a huge priority right now

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

It is not a priority right now

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9547



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 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:

Funding council services will benefit the general community more

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Public benefit should be a priority

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9547

**Tell us why:**

Public benefit should be the priority

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#9547



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	Very Important
--	----------------



#9547



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

Cultural maintenance is important

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I mostly support it

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#9547



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a



#9547



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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?



#9550



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, 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?

Other

Tell us here:

I think they should keep the wharf how it is

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#9550



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

The future is more important

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

N/a

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#9550



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#9550



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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	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?



#9551



No

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport should be more reliable as some people rely on it for their transportation. This would mean being more time and reliability efficient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I'm not sure what this means.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 not sure what this means.



#9551



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I dont know what this means.

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 what this means.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

N/A

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#9551

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9551



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Not sure.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

N/A



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?

NIL

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

NIL



#9553



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

NIL

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

NIL

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

NIL

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

nil

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

NIL

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9553



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

NIL

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

NIL

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

NIL

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

`NIL

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9553



Tell us why:

NIL

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other



#9553



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

NIL

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

NIL



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9554



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It's good

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public transportation

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It has the opportunity to be used more in various things

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

So that it is well controlled and not run by people with ulterior motives



#9554



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Allow more profitability

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

To allow a good use of the money

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

It is an important place

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know



#9554



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#9554



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	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



#9559



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Personally, I catch public transport to and from school everyday and i have for the last 4 years. I believe that the public transport does not need any more money or effort towards it

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We do not need to spend so much money on a stadium that is barely used.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9559



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

None

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook 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?



#9559



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9559



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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 more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

community events - use that money for other things like roads, construction, etc.



#9560



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

traffic sucks

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

more lanes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

redoing the roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Rather than use money towards the stadium, it's better to put that money towards education and transport.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 seems fine



#9560



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Price for imports would likely increase if it's not under council

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 educated enough to make an informed decision

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook 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:



#9560

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9560



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The police systems and better entertainment.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9561



the transport systems.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#9561



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:

Maybe PUT MORE MONEY FOR POLICE MEN AND IMPROVE THE SECURITY SYSTEM.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#9561



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#9561



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I think we should improve the security system.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

none



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	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?

Please do something about the lack of efficiency in construction and urban development — if work hours are too limiting, hire more and better workers.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9562



Focus on national development by encouraging national businesses and entrepreneurship and decrease international debt.

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:

The Auckland airport doesn't need more shares, just keep it in stasis. Invest the money for Auckland's Future Fund into developing the economy of NZ instead of putting us in more debt.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9562



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#9562



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#9562



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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



#9562



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

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?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#9563



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support all of the proposals, however, some of these ideas do require roadwork which could cause inconvenience for a long period of time. But if these projects take a short amount of time I think it's a reasonable idea.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I would spend more money for buses to be on time and for them to not cancel so frequently. It can get frustrating especially when it's a school bus.

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:

Maintaining the stadium would cost the exact same amount as doing a reallocation. Currently, the stadium has barely any use and so we should start thinking of other things we could do with that space.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#9563



I don't know

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I don't know

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I don't know

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't know

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know



#9563

**Tell us why:**

I don't know

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Other
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other



#9563



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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	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?

Allowing phone uses during school breaks times.



#9564



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need more buses. It's really hard for me to get to school if I miss one bus. Because the other one comes after 20 minutes. The district I live gets a lot of cancellations and delays its very frustrating.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nope no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nope

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

The toilet kind of smells

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Not sure



#9564



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

So we can get more people.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

More buses please !

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 dont live in that district

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9564



Tell us why:

Why not

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#9564



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Support
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Free wifi please

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Franklin

Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Very Important
---	----------------



#9564



projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that are willing to and capable of delivering social, environmental, cultural and economic outcomes in line with the local board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuānuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Very Important
Find ways to reduce Franklin's maintenance costs e.g. by replacing lawn with eco-sourced native trees and reducing or relocating public rubbish bins.	
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

Tell us why

I like franklin street especially in christmas seasons



#9564



7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Over 10m

Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Auranga

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nope



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	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?

Unsure

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Unsure



#9565



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland's public transport (specifically it's trains) are very slow and are severely outdated compare to countries like Australia

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Unsure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Unsure

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

There is no point in up-keeping the stadium if it is not going to be used, either take it down or redevelop it to be used more often.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9565



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?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#9565



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#9565



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	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?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#9567



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

all sounds good to me

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

buildings

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:

It has been this way for years now, so any major changes may be unappealing.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

yes

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9567



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

improved profitability for the council enables the government to have a higher 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 it would benefit us in the future

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Public benefit is important C:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9567



Tell us why:

yes

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know



#9567



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

None

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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	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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9573



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transportation upgrades are good but It cost a lot of materials and may harm the environment

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:

I think the North Harbour stadium is good 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:

Airports is a good upgrade but I don't really think you can upgrade anything in airports.



#9573



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

No

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I don't know

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No feed back

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I dont know

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know



#9573

**Tell us why:**

I do not know where Bledisloe Terminal is.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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



#9573



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No more feedback.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

no



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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?

Economic and cultural development, it would be good to further support the economy, especially around housing and mortgage, as many people are struggling. It would be great to see improvements in transport, to make transport more efficient, more safer.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9577



I think everything currently is good,

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think it's great to improve the transport system as a bus user myself, I would love to see more efficient buses and better/ safer roads.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

efficient transport.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

the Stadium should be kept as it is important for sport events, maybe changing the operational management team to be more efficient and budget wisely.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#9577



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The council should use the money on something else, maybe in the near future the port could be improved.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It should stay the same for now, to continue port operation.



#9577

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9577



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

N/A

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#9577



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think it's good

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
--	----------------



#9577



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?

It's good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

N/A

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9585



N/A

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Just don't

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Because it needs to stay but is not operative atm

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 valuable



#9585



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 valuable

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Because u need revenue

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9585



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#9585



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

n/a

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.	Very Important
--	----------------



#9585



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?

its good

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?



#9585



Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?

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	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?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

n/a



#9588



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think that making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions sounds like a good idea, network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes also is a good idea. It makes sense to stop previously planned initiatives like cycleways, but its important to keep raised crossings for safety and will make drivers be more aware of the road.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More reliable transport would be best to spend on more as this is a problem for certain places in NZ, as some places don't have regular transport in their area.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cycleways, I think there is less importance to cycleways than any other transport, so it isn't needed as much as cars, bus and trains, etc.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Its best to redevelop the stadium as meeting the needs for North Shore community sounds like a better idea than keeping it at a cost of 33M, as a lot of that 33M could be spent making it a better stadium and will help the growth of North Harbour Stadium with more events.



#9588



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

better option for Auckland Future Fund

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:



#9588



5b. What option do you prefer 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
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	



#9588



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

n/a

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour, Waitematā

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#9588



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
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.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	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



#9588



following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to 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?

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Fairly Important
Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Very Important
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	Fairly Important
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Very Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important



#9588



Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Fairly Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitematā proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

Enhancing public safety in our public transport development plans.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#9619



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Parents will not feel comfortable for their children to use public transport if safety concerns are not addressed. Young people have been victims of assaults and thefts on public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Enhancing safety.

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:

Community organisations could collectively activate the stadium in ways that benefit the community. This could happen alongside a profit making (and or) social enterprise model of 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

NA



#9619



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

NA

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

There needs to be greater impartiality in the funding of council services.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

NZ

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

NA

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know



#9619



Tell us why:

NA

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#9619



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

NA

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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
--	----------------



#9619



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?

Approve.

8. Do you have any other comments?

NA



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	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?

invest in public transport and large free car parking at bus stations. Sell auckland transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9620



Stop wasting money on cycle lanes and raised pedestrian crossings. Also wastage on roading that is already working ok. Get the right people for decision making and allow for public submissions for those affected to have their say.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The wrong people have been making decisions in AT leading to ridiculous costs. Along Tamaki drive for instance there are cycle lanes but cyclists and scooters are everywhere - road, foot path, intersections - and creating more risk for others.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Get Albany stadium sorted and used as a venue for more events. Advertising for more tourism from local and abroad to boost the economy.

Make the CBD a safer place. Drinking laws as they have in Sydney around pub access.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Just wasteful spending.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Other

Tell us why:

Good venue and good access, plenty of parking. This could be used and improved as a great place for events.



#9620



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 as a future investment and 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:

Keep the income returns as currently improving. Why give this opportunity to an outside company who will run the port operations into the ground and take all profits offshore. There are options to keep making money and use some spaces for council investment and public use.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

The council needs money to run Auckland so getting it from an essential service makes sense over the long term.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9620



I think keeping the port is a great opportunity to develop profitable enterprise in the port operation and other use of some land to earn money in other ways.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 investment or public use as needed

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The port needs land in order to make money. All the cars need to offload somewhere and the council makes money from this terminal area as a result.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#9620



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9620



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.	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.	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.	I don't know
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.	I don't know



#9620



Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do more that has the greatest impact for the most people. We could give up some of the free events to direct money to other public projects.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9630



Less free events.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

All for public transport improvements. All for improved walkability and cycling, but they must be linked, not a continuation of the disparate collection we currently have. Do it where it has the greatest impact, increase density, livability and connectivity around centres and rapid transit. Stop green field expansion at all cost.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

intensification and the servicing of that. Safety should always be a consideration.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

this has a lot to offer with the number of sports already located here. It is the only truly possibly location to enable a complex the likes of Melbourne. It has good public transport links and an area which could accommodate cricket at lesser cost and impact than refitting Victoria Park. Increase residential activity and it has a heap of potential. We don't need a waterfront stadium.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know



#9630



Tell us why:

You don't give many options here. There is probably some sort of hybrid of these options that could work. Sell the shares once and the future income is gone, not the best idea. We need to fund projects now to enable some sort of future, not save the rainy day (pun intended).

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

This needs way more consideration, not the flip flopping from one idea to another. Keep it, move it, lease it. What is the best outcome for Auckland? We don't need all the land to be publicly accessible, we have quite a lot now, just not very well realised and too conflicted by cruise ship operations. The Quay Street upgrade is nice, but underwhelming in scale and experience. Queens Wharf has a temporary shed, an old shed and an artwork, it has a load of untapped potential. No waterfront stadium required. A cultural museum is a consideration.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Work need to happen now, sure it will be required in the future, but will it just be a continual catchup, revealed by how poorly serviced the city infrastructure is now.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9630



Good design and delivery of good design will be hugely beneficial to the quality and character of the city and port space.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

We don't need every wharf to be publicly accessible, there are 40,000 city residents and there is enough space for them now and planned. Move cruise activity away from ferry building to reduce disruption. Move all freight movements to rail to reduce road

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

This is a huge space and not needed for public use. If it were to be developed commercially what would the restoration costs be before any work could even start. Reclaimed land probably isn't the first place to redevelop.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Support



#9630



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9630



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Fairly Important



#9630



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

our open spaces are widely used and by a wide range from outside the local board area. As a key city wide destination it is very important that the open spaces are maintained and improved for the benefit of all. Don't need so many free events to be funded by the local board.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Supportive of improvements to public transport services and facilities. Need to promote the need for dedicated bus lanes from Albany to Silverdale, travelling with the general traffic is not a drawcard. Push back against the proposed Rapid Transit Route to Milldale from Dairy Flat. There is a real issue which needs addressing now.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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	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?



#9664



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#9664



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#9664



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#9664



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Very Important



#9664



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	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9684



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No commitment from Government regards money. So far they give a message of don't spend.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Infrastructure roading and water.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Not really a shame the Government cancelled the Auckland fuel tax.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We can't lose the stadium as it used to be a reasonable venue for sports and concerts. Auckland Council (the old and new one) need nothing to encourage events ther. They seem to put up every objection they could to promote the venue.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Don't see selling off the assents as a good long term option.



#9684



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 has total control and via some investors which would tend to lean to over seas ones.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Caught between Continue and Invest, long term I think invest is better.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Council have complete control for the future..

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9684

**Tell us why:**

Encourage tourists and Aucklanders into the CBD.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#9684



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#9684



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.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

Tell us why

Communities need all the help they can get,

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Okay

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities



#9684



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	Do less
Water	Do less
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?

Devolve more power and responsibility to the local boards, grant larger budgets and allow for local boards to tender for and control expenditure on roading projects such as pedestrian crossings.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9717



Social re-engineering. Far too much time is spent on telling us how to live out lives. AC is not a social engineering agency and should stick to its knitting of providing civil services. The government can drive social change, e.g. greater use of Te Reo. It is not the council's role.

Duplication of services between the Council and the CCO's. For a city the size of Auckland the question of why there are 4 or more Chief Financial Officers, Chief IT Managers, Heads of personnel etc has to be addressed. Not every CCO needs a full back office service team. IT could be centralised for the council and all the CCO's, same for finance and human resources.

The elected council needs to get hold and take control of the unbelievable arrogance of the CCO's, where the majority of the rates raised goes.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

AT has lost its focus. It now believes that it is a social reengineering agency and continually tries to tell Aucklanders how to live their lives. It needs to get back to its primary focus of providing a working effective and reliable transport network.

By charging people to use park and rides, it will defeat its own target of increasing public transportation usage. Noone is going to add another half hour or more to their daily commute waiting for and catching connecting services. Given the lack of covered and weather sealed bus stops, this idea should not be given any further consideration.

Furthermore, the standard and quality of the road repairs carried out by Fulton Hogan and other preferred contractors leaves a lot to be desired. I also question the standards that they work to and the quality of the inspections carried out by council. Wainui road between the motorway and Waitoki road is repaired annually because of this poor quality workmanship, at a substantial cost to us the ratepayers.

Too much time, energy and cost is spent on so called safety measures which do not generate the results hoped for. Expensive raised platforms do no better than painted pedestrian crossings. Institute stricter policing and higher fines for motorists not following Zebra crossing rules and the need for expensive raised platforms is done away with.

Far tighter control of costs for new and refurbishment works is required by the council. Council staff are too cosy and close to the small group of preferred contractors who get



#9717



all the AT capital works. Opening up the contracting business to a larger group of contractors will make the incumbents more cost effective and competitive. An investigation into kickbacks to AT staff such as free sport tickets etc is long overdue.

AT will receive 40% of Opex and 38 % of Capex over the 10 years without any accountability to the ratepayers. This must be addressed. The board and senior management have to be held accountable to the residents of the city and implement what they, the payers of their salaries, want.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Replace the single decker busses with double decker ones and use them during the peak periods, with more acting as express busses from the suburbs to the city center. For the Northern bus route, use double deckers feeder busses around the suburbs, stop at the bus stations and then express all the way into the city with no need to change busses.

Outside of peak times, replace all bus services with 14 - 20 person electric maxi cabs, as demand requires. Outside of peak times, single deck busses are near empty in the suburbs.

Multi Storey park and ride facilities whereby the ground level areas are commercially rented to cover the capital and ongoing expense of the building. This would increase availability of parking for bus users and lead to an increase in bus usage. Under no circumstances should bus users pay for parking.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

City rail link. This is a project that only benefits a small area of the city, it has no impact on any one North of the bridge. Some communities in the South who use rail may get a better service.

It is wrong that the whole city is paying for an asset that serves so few of us. Home owners in areas served by the CRL will get increased capital gains off the back of the general rates paid by those who get no benefit. Targeted rates for those areas that benefit the most is a better idea.

Costs associated with a bike ferry from Northcote to the city, this will be so underutilised as to be an embarrassment.

Any expansion of the cycle way network until the existing network is shown to be fully utilised.



#9717



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Since the amalgamation of the Super City, the North Shore has received a bad deal from the Auckland Council and the mismanagement of the stadium is a prime example of this. Taking land from the stadium for basketball usage, which is since gone bankrupt was driven by the Council sitting in Auckland with no understanding of the local needs.

Return the management to the local board and give it the budget and authority to manage the asset.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Spreading of investment risk is a given for increasing wealth over the long term. AIAL is a single investment with mediocre returns. The Ports are a single investment in the same broad genre as the Airport and subject to the same market forces. Return on investment is poor.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#9717



By retaining the land for another 5 years, the council can use this time to develop a long-term plan to move the port and redevelop the land.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Investments should be focussed on growth not day to day operational expenses.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance is a good idea and works. Our business has done this for many years and saved enormous amounts of money. Diligent management of the insurance fund is paramount.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Central Auckland is not the place it used to be. Less and less people are coming into the city center for casual entertainment and enjoyment. Between AT taking away parking and poor public transport late at night and Eke Panuka removing the parking at the

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#9717



Tell us why:

Only if it is cost neutral to the city rate payers

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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



#9717



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I have no faith in the council's ability to manage the money raised for the NETR, CATTR and WQTR or any other targeted rate being only used for the purpose that it intended for.

Redirection of the existing budget into these areas should be possible by managing the waste inherent in council operations.

These functions are core functions, and the council should reduce its expenditure in other non-core areas to cover these costs.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9717



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	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

Spending money on under used cycle ways is poor use of limited services. Very careful consideration n where to extend or provide new pathways is required to ensure we get the best value for money. Loud special interest groups should not dominate where our rates are spent.



#9717



Removing the discriminatory situation whereby Milwater residents pay the servicing costs of wastewater pumps should be a priority for our local board.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Taking over local small road and other works from AT and the council, whereby the LB can issue and manage the tenders / construction of these works. Paying nearly a million dollars for a public toilet shows just how out of touch AT and the rest of the council is when it comes to local works.

8. Do you have any other comments?

CCO Accountability

There is continuously issue with the CCO's acting on their own ideologies and agendas, not following the elected members or the general public needs. They have developed within themselves a culture of non-accountability and this needs to be changed.

The two worst are AT and Eke Panuka. AT rides roughshod over local community feedback, be it relating to lower speed limits, cycleways, bus services or road maintenance. The blanket speed reductions on rural roads did not consider the local needs and the arrogance of the response from AT just showed how far from their customers they are.

EP are in my opinion a corrupt organization. The chairman, Paul Majurey is also chairman of Marutuahua, a property development group. EP sells council land to Marutuahu, no transparency regarding the sale price. I am not sure how it has come about that the chairman of a developer is also the chair of a CCO that sells land to developers.

There have been other questions asked in the past about the sale of council land to friends of the board, e.g. Centreway in Orewa to the developer John Bolan.

The CCO's need to be brought back under elected officials' control and be accountable to the residents and taxpayers.

The council should consider a stronger user pays / targeted rates regime. For example, the central interceptor provides for the clean up of the beaches around central Auckland, it does not assist the mess on the North Shore. Central Auckland property owner benefit from this major development, paid for by all ratepayers. NS



#9717



residents see no benefit to the sewerage spills on their beaches, but they are paying a substantial fee in their Watercare bills to benefit central Auckland. Similarly, for the CRL, this is paid for by all ratepayers but in reality, only benefits those who have access to the rail network, which excludes the whole of the North Shore and Hibiscus Coast.

Rates to pay for these projects should have been targeted against those who benefit the most.

Additional Comments on the Auckland Long Term Plan 2024 - 2034.**Watercare increased charges**

The document fails to clearly identify the real increase to ratepayers. It only refers to increases in council rates and has a one-line statement that Watercare will increase its rates in 2025 by 25.8%. WC does not provide details of proposed rates increase over the next 10 years.

The Council LTP Document implies that the general rates increase is necessary to cover Watercare's capital expenditure, which is not true. Watercare funds its Opex and Capex through its user charges. No rate payer rates are provided to Watercare other than for joint ACC and WC projects.

Considering the increase in Watercare charges, an analysis of my own charges indicates an increase of 28.5% over the last 5 years. I am of course able to manage this by using less water, resulting in a dead lawn for 4 months of the year, and have reduced my consumption to an increase in costs of only 15% over this period.

However, there is only so much that can be cut back on before one's lifestyle is seriously affected, making a mockery of your comments that Auckland is a desirable place to live.

My out-of-pocket expenses since 2019, combining ACC rates and Watercare is \$ 440 extra in 2024 to date. Watercare is 1/3rd the overall increase.

With Watercare's proposed 25.8% increase for 2025, and the council's proposed 7.5% increase, the actual effect is an increase of \$ 400.00 per year or approximately 10% if I reduce my water consumption even further.

There is also the ridiculous charge for food scrap collection, which we can't opt out of even if we compost it ourselves, of \$ 72.00, and the true increase in rates is closer to 11%.

CCO Duplicity

Each CCO has its own IT, finance and HR departments and systems, as well as ACC itself. There must be millions if not 100's of millions of savings over the 10 year period if these were all combined and centralized. After all there are substantially larger businesses with centralized back office services.

The CCO's are a blight on Auckland and every effort should be made over the next 5 years to reintegrate them into the council and make them accountable to the ratepayers.

Alternative Funding Source

The housing intensification within the city raises the question of infrastructure needs. Within large parts of "old" Auckland, the infrastructure requires rehabilitation and increasing capacity to cope with in-fill housing. The densification of these suburbs further exacerbates the poor state of the infrastructure.

While development and connection charges help to cover some of the costs, they are woefully short of what is needed.

Greenfield sites on the other hand pay for the new infrastructure within the developments themselves via higher land prices and the development levies are now being charged at a level

which will cover the costs of bringing infrastructure to a new area. All these costs are included in the price the land is ultimately sold for. This figure can be as high as 20 -25% of the land cost.

New infrastructure is largely maintenance low cost for the first 20 – 25 years of its life, bar an unexpected break down. It makes sense then to start to charge an infrastructure fee to these older suburbs, because these areas need infrastructure upgrades, not needed in newer suburbs.

Furthermore, any sale of land for redevelopment and increased density should attract a substantial fee for infrastructure renewal, similar to the proportion of the land price a green fields plot has included in its price.

I would propose that the Council investigates the imposition of an infrastructure fee on all land sales of houses or buildings older than 20 years since the main structure was granted a clearance certificate. The fee should be variable between 20 and 25 years so that at 25 years the full fee is charged. It should be charged on the land value as determined by the Council's three yearly valuation and excludes capital costs.

For multiple residences on the land, an extra fee per unit should also be charged.

This would then bring infrastructure charges into balance between new and older suburban areas and bring about a greater user pays regime. At the moment residents in new suburbs are funding the infrastructure upgrades in the older suburbs, because there is no mechanism for these suburbs to pay for their own other than through targeted rates, which the council does not appear to want to use.

I am sure there are enough intelligent people within council to develop this concept further so that within 4-5 years the plan can be implemented. This would unlock millions of dollars to be used for infrastructure repairs and enhancements in the older areas and as newer areas age, the same will happen there.

[REDACTED]

26 March 2024



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

None

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9753



Please stop on the increased Refuse Targeted Rate amount based on the approximate number of months the service is available to you, even if you choose not to use it. This is robbery as the current household rubbish bags only cost me \$20 per year, and the increased rate is \$105 for the year and we don't have that much house hold waste to throw. And this will encourage people to create more waste cos you will have to pay that much no matter if you have that much waste or not! This is a killing idea to rob the residents and kill the environment. Must stop it

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport need to be reasonable enhanced as the population increases

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nop

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nop

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:

Reduce the waste

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#9753



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Stop rip off the residents by the enforcement of paying Refuse Targeted Rate even if you choose not to use it. It's not fair, people should only pay for what they use, otherwise it's totally robbery

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#9753



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#9753



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Stop rip off the residents by the enforcement of paying Refuse Targeted Rate even if you choose not to use it. It's not fair, people should only pay for what they use, otherwise it's totally robbery

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#9753



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Stop rip off the residents by the enforcement of paying Refuse Targeted Rate even if you choose not to use it. It's not fair, people should only pay for what they use, otherwise it's totally robbery



#9753



8. Do you have any other comments?

Stop rip off the residents by the enforcement of paying Refuse Targeted Rate even if you choose not to use it. It's not fair, people should only pay for what they use, otherwise it's totally robbery



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



#9756



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways would be a bad move to help decrease the amount of car traffic on our roads & to help provide safe spaces for pedestrians & cyclists

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Second harbour crossing & trains going to the north shore

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#9756



Lease the port for a longer period of time. It might not be feasible for companies to establish themselves within 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:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#9756



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#9756



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Very Important



#9756



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?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	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?



#9772



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#9772



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#9772



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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 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?



#9780



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#9780



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#9780



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

1b. 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?



#9798



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

trains to the north shore.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#9798



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#9798



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9818



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#9818



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#9818

Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#9818



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9818



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	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?

Recycling facilities

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9837



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think more should be done on expanding public transport and cycle lanes.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle lanes and public transport.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

I think investment should be made in evolving the 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Council should hang on to its assets, if they sell them off private forms will not maintain them as their motivation is profit over people .

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9837



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#9837



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9837



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#9837



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

Creativity and arts are fundamental to a thriving city.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	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?



#9838



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't agree with stopping development of cycleways and walkways

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cycleways and walkways

2b. 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 precinct does not appear to be used as much as it could be. Further consideration of how this space could be used better is necessary.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 Future Fund would provide a long-term buffer to future uncertainties, allowing security of funding over time. It could also reduce future rates rises.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9838



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 immediately provide substantial financial investment in the Future Fund

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#9838



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9838



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#9838



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?

Priorities are generally robust although I would have liked to see at least one priority focus on conservation within the local board 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 less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop spraying roundup. Maintain green spaces to a safe standard only. No weeding or flower beds. Stop doing work which is for aesthetics. Stop using intergroup to do non urgent sewage maintenance on weekends. We had a blockage just pass the



#9842



manhole on our property. Intergroup came back 5 times after they first fixed blockage to give the pipe another flush, even coming back on a Sunday evening !?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The Harbour Bridge is moving at peak times! We know cos we live on the Nth Shore. It's the bottle necks north & south of the bridge are where it stops.. However, Ak has hit Critical Mass with cars at peak times and building more roads isn't going to do anything, apart from, not finding a solution. The council needs to stop development of new office space in the CBD, by introducing huge increases in rates on any new office developments! To meet AK's office space requirements by, encourageing office space development in the North Shore, West Ak, East Ak & Sth AK by lowering rates for office developments outside of the CBD. Existing CBD office building owners need to be warned, they will face increases in rates above that of areas outside of the CBD. CBD offices that are converted to above 75% housing space will get lowered rates.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improvements to public transport network!

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

To help pay it's way, The stadium just needs to be used for more events



#9842



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Those assets need to be kept for the benefit of 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 continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Ports of AK does paid a dividend. Any money from a lease off would be used on vanity projects. Any Leaseholder would run the port into the ground.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 doesn't need help from outside companies on how to spend 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?



#9842



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The cost is too much! "These works are required to allow some port operations to be moved and would cost around \$110 million..."

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The only benefit I got from Wynard Quarter & Viaduct Harbour developments apart from cafes & restaurants I don't use, was seeing Chinese workers granted visas to build the Park Hyatt.. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/357498/chinese-workers-granted-visas-to-build-auckland-hotel>

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support



#9842



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

an expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID). NOT NEEDED!.... No to pool and leisure centres fee increases.



#9842



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Not Important



#9842



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?

Cut all – support for local community organisations to deliver economic development initiatives

8. Do you have any other comments?

Support Festivals like pasifika, Chinese new years etc.. However the following sounds vague and could be cut. "Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion 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?

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?

For me, the two overarching issues facing the people of Auckland are climate change and protecting our environment as much as possible for future generations. These factors need to be first and foremost incorporated into every policy and regulation, eg, in transport, residential and industrial development, the 3 arms of waters management, parks and reserves.



#9852



In regards to water, I would like implemented greater subsidisation or rewarding of the installation of water tanks. it should be mandatory for all new builds, whether domestic or industrial. this will reduce risk of water supply issues especially at times of drought, and lessen the severity of floods. Also, all new industrial buildings should be 'green buildings' including consideration of rooftop green space and water harvesting.

The enhancement of environmental protection programmes, eg, waste minimisation, natural ecosystem maintenance and restoration, low carbon transport choices are all imperative.

1d. Is there anything else 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 support a stronger, more connected public transport system - bus, rail, ferry, making it as accessible as possible to all Aucklanders.

This includes heavily subsidised fees to encourage increased and wide public usage, thus reducing the need for personally owned cars. I certainly support a cap of \$50 per week per person for use of public transport. The Northern Busway is a success that should be duplicated for West and East Auckland. The City Rail Link should be completed, and level crossings made safe.

I certainly support better connectivity for cycle and pedestrian traffic. My grandchildren would much prefer to cycle to school, but it is too unsafe, with no cycle lanes for them to use.

It is good to see the move to electrification of buses and ferries. I would recommend that more refuelling stations were made for electric cars.

Extending the urban limit of Auckland and allowing green-field urbanisation should be halted immediately. Auckland should be intensifying around transport corridors. Extending the urban limit would mean that many more people would need to use cars as public transport is often woeful in new outer suburbs. .

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?



#9852



Yes.

Greater subsidies for public transport.

Mechanisms/pathways to enhance cycling safety.

Electrification of buses and ferries

Level crossings made safe

Regional Fuel Tax - I am sorry that the Government is stopping the Regional Fuel Tax. I believe that this was a fairer way of raising funds for Auckland transport networks compared to congestion charges, whether they be based on Auckland city circuit or peak-time travel densities. Many workers will not have a choice in timing to meet work or other commitments - others, often those in more senior management positions, will have flexibility in the times they choose to travel to work. With the RFT, everyone who is using cars (petrol or diesel fuelled) pays towards this tax.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes. New motorway development or Roads of National Significance.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

This is a valuable asset for the whole area north of Auckland city. if the stadium were to be disestablished, it would be almost impossible for it to be replaced as a facility needed in the future. It very likely needs to be better managed to attract larger events that would more heavily contribute to operational costs. It has been successful 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#9852



Tell us why:

More information is needed before I can support establishing this fund.

Questions such as clear definition of purpose of fund, which or what kind of project or situation would it support, safeguards it was used for the specified purposes, administration, accountability, etc. need to be answered.

There is a high risk that funds would be frittered away for this, that and the other thing as a convenient way to fund pet projects.

While it is good to have a fund for emergency or crisis situations, I do not support it is developed through the sale of assets.

Such a fund needs to have very

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

This is an asset which if well managed could provide a good return to Auckland. it should not be sold, or available for a long-term lease.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

There is insufficient information about the perimeters of the Future Fund for profits and dividends to be invested here.



#9852



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Opening the waterfront to the public would be a great Auckland City asset.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support



#9852



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have 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 targeted rates for the natural environment, water quality and climate action should all be retained as ways of protecting our environment and reducing carbon emissions.



#9852



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#9852



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

Each of these priorities lend themselves to the health of the community.

One of the greatest issues facing our future, if not THE major issue, is climate change. Climate change considerations can be a high priority factor - or are supported - in implementing each of these priorities.

Supporting activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and creativity in the community supports a sense of identity, wellness, and belonging.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support each of them.

Supporting and advocating for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting must also include protecting the whole of the natural ecosystems surrounding our waterways.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I support fairer funding for Local Boards under the 'Pay more, Get more' proposal.

I note that the total capital fund to renew and develop Local Board assets is \$1311.1m, and only 6.4m is allocated to Environmental Services. Given the importance of protecting the environment for current and future generations, the amount for Environmental Services should be significantly increased.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	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.



#9856



- 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?

Keeping public transport free for under 12s, or older young people (up to 16 or those attending school). Having public transport subsidised for everyone in peak times and/or peak traffic areas. If part of the plan is to introduce peak congestion charges for cars then public transport for those areas should be improved and subsidised.

2b. 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



#9856



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Diversify the fund but limit the amount the Airport shares can be sold (percentage of total shares held). Fund needs to be managed in a cost effective way (set management fees), investments should be ethical and support Auckland and NZ businesses.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 too long to lease the land for.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Split the proceeds between the future fund and council services.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9856



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support



#9856



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#9856



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.	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



#9856



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

“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	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?



#9879



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Safety and getting around via PT is important.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Glenvar road is an absolute essential.

The bus area at the end of Penlink is necessary if PT is going to work efficiently from day one Penlink opens.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Massive speed humps. A more gentle speed humps is just as effective. Put in manufactured speed humps. Safety is paramount.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It worked better under North Shore city and we should have a facility on the North Shore instead of everyone travelling South.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 not totally convinced setting up a fund for the future is a priority who is to say it won't get spent by future councils.



#9879



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

The Port needs to go. Heavy trucks are destroying our roads and not paying a fair share of fixing them. The whole area needs YES to be owned by Council but there needs to be more public space and private investor should build an ALL stadium down there where PT is easily accessible for ALL areas 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:

There needs to be a comprehensive study done to see how the council can operate not only rates people can't keep paying, Government needs to be paying a fair share.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

As population grows we are going to need more not less of public space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#9879



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#9879



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support 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
--	----------------



#9879



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

We live in a beautiful part of Auckland and we need to keep supporting our groups who do such wonderful work in our area

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We need to make sure we keep our environment clean and encourage our volunteer groups. All sporting activities should be 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?

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?

I would like Auckland Council to do more for the Mairangi Bay Surf Club, The surf club is an important part of our community, providing essential lifeguarding services (MBSLSC has over 150 lifeguards who actively patrol to save lives, as well as over 500 junior surf children). The current building is run down and and needs replacement.



#9890



If the MBSLSC is to continue functioning and providing community and essential services then it has to have an adequate building and storage. We request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan for rebuilding and ongoing maintenance of the surf life saving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Regions'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:



#9890



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.



#9890



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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 are a community centre for the hundreds of young people who do surf life saving on a Sunday morning and surf sports throughout



#9890



the week, and provide essential services in emergencies, such as the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabriells. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in Auckland Anniversary floods - while operating out of the inadequate storage shipping containers. Funding for a new Surf Life Saving building is essential to continue these services.

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	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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Development of city centre



#9894



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Capped weekly transport passes and payment ease. Also reduce the subsidy. Stop all raised crossing builds and cycleways

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport should be a user pay system otherwise NO

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public Transport subsidy

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Make it a more usable 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

This is all about Selling the shares to build a Slush fund to be Drained for Pet Projects



#9894



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 again a Slush Fund for Pet Projects. The Mayor is to be Not Trusted

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Always be aware of Hidden Agendas

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Let's start with these two wharves and see if we're capable of doing something beneficial first.



#9894



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Let's start with the other two wharves first it's a Trust Issue and Probable Hidden Agendas at play here.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support



#9894



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#9894



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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.	Very Important

Tell us why

These are beneficial to the community

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Happy with most priorities



#9894



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	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrading public transport to connect the Hibiscus Coast to the rest of the city

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9913



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

These projects are great, but I would like more

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Upgrading cycleways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#9913



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:

I would like a slow transition of infrastructure like the port away from the CBD area.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#9913



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#9913



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Very Important



#9913



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

Hibiscus Coast is in dire need for biking and walking infrastructure

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good start, but needs more work on adding walking and cycling infrastructure. Hibiscus coast highway is particularly dangerous to walk or bike on with some areas completely lacking a footpath putting pedestrians up against 60km/h traffic. Would be great to have connectivity between cycling lanes in Orewa to the Hibiscus Coast Bus station.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9919



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?

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?



#9919



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#9919



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9919



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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 other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important



#9919



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?

Some roading safety measures have proved overly expensive and for no apparent benefit e.g. raised pedestrian crossings. Stop those and use normal pedestrian crossings which are cheaper and quicker to deliver. No new cycle paths as these are



#9920



not the best way to get commuters out of cars due to travel distances. How much is raised from scooters in city as this could provide revenue stream. Reduce funding for museums and introduce small charge for Aucklanders to visit them e.g. half price peak times and free at other times.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Narrowing road for bus specific lane what is time impact on other commuters. Dynamic lanes are excellent.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Road maintenance potholes should be dealt with more quickly.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Auckland centre projects which are reducing road capacity for example the pedestrianisation of Queen Street.

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 stadium for North Harbour and needs a better local management team to help it self fund. Concerts as well as 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)?



#9920



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Climate change mitigation is a national problem and should be funded centrally to all regions on a needs basis. This model would seem to ensure a consistent approach as otherwise do we charge people getting the benefit a premium on their council bills for them being in affected area?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

This is an asset for the city and leasing will provide long term annual costs. Look at current structure to make cost savings. Short term capital income is like a loan in the long term you pay back a lot more than the initial amount you get and create a 35 year repayment 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:

This fund needs not to be lost in day to day business. It should go on essential council services and not be available to fund any vanity projects. Ring fence it for a specific element e.g. transport across Auckland (maintaining essential infrastructure).

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9920



No future fund we have no capacity in a cost of living crisis to put increased burden on already struggling households. Lower head counts in short term in any non front facing essential areas. Review budgets for parts of council 2016 to now and head counts and determine where extra staff are we as a region getting a benefit or in tough times do we have to make necessary cuts.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

What is the why and how much will it cost to implement? Is this needed to be done now? Will it give back more money than it costs? We can't keep spending more without balancing costs more carefully.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

What is the commercial why and is this not a potential loss of benefit. These changes seem better suited to be reviewed when less pressure on family finances.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#9920



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support



#9920



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Seems about increased costs and not better services. Rodney collections work well not sure of the why for this or changes to collection timings planned. Seems backwards planning to pretend recycling is fixed.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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



#9920



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

Most of these may be suitable when times are good but cost pressures should focus mind on what are our big important things we must.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Make sure Watercare, AT and other big institutions are doing what is needed and do not rubber stamp non essential works or investigate them as costs need to be minimised to keep rates down.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Review staffing from past years to make sure numbers have not ballooned and where they have grown are they benefiting the community? Review projects as to essential or not. Unite with other councils to put pressure on government to fund climate based projects maybe enlist Green Party here.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less free things , concerts, open days etc.

more efficient new dwelling plan processing- stop wasting our time.



#9938



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?

keeping transport fares lower

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:

used to have lots more events, when run by the trust. why can't it be used more - have the current team just given up on promoting it. is a great location nice for watching a game on the main stadium field, or the surrounding fields

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9938



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

Industry in the middle of city, and port activities is interesting and should be part of the city scape. but just parking cars is not a great use- although I like the big screen on the side which shows different art work LED

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#9938



like the industry as part of city activities, like the income and like less trucks and trains on city streets

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#9938



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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
--	----------------



#9938



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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

kayak wharf at Millwater as promised

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do 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 larger forest areas.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9957



There are enough festivals. Every weekend there are festivals on - great to get people out into the community but there are too many.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The endless raised pedestrian crossings are a waste of money. One was installed at Milford school, then removed but the raised bit is still there so its worse than it started - the kids don't know who has right of way. The three sets of traffic lights above Centennial Park screams of someone having shares in the company.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Pest plant control. Pest plants are a major threat to our biodiversity and especially as they creep further into our wild native ecosystems. Waste minimisation from the source lobby central government to do more to limit waste.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Festivals. Great to have a vibrant city but there are too many.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

there has been an enormous amount of money spent on a stadium - use it more. have those endless festivals there. Have concerts there - not in suburban Mt Eden.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#9957



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#9957

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#9957



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#9957



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?

They are great. A good long term plan is needed for the flood prone 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?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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?

Nope.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Nope.



#9969



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It is reasonable and will definitely make the lives of daily partakers in the transport system much easier.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nope.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nope.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

I think the stadium is fine.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9969



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?

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.



#9969



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#9969



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey, Waitākere Ranges

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Fairly Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Fairly Important



#9969



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

I 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).	Fairly Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	Fairly Important
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	Very Important
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Very Important
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Fairly Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Not Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Very Important



#9969



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 more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10020



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?



#10020



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#10020



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10020



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	Not Important



#10020



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	
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?



#10025



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:

This is the newest stadium in Auckland and the only one north of the harbour bridge. It is an important facility for the growing population and is in a very good location with easy motorway access and adequate parking. The pool is also a very good asset that so many enjoy.

Supporters of the stadium would be disappointed if this precinct wasn't maintained after all the millions made from fundraising, donations and ratepayers north of the harbour bridge that went into paying for it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Establish a future fund, but not by selling the remaining shares in Auckland Airport.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#10025



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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



#10025



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#10025



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10025



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10028



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Costly and time-consuming

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Who is responsible for the money spent?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Not enough information



#10028



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 information

4d. Do you have 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.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Do not support



#10028



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10028



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	



#10028



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

没有人来跟我们解释过

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Hundreds of pages of paper, all in English, who can understand it?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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?

More free services for Gulf Harbour, EV ferry investment.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10031



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More investment in ferry and trains, people do not want to use buses, they are miserable and inefficient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Infrastructure generally.

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:

It is not clear the fund would return a higher rate than the Airport, there also may already be diversification across the councils assets. Not against it just needs more analysis.



#10031



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Need to know the net present value of the port dividends for 35 years it may be more than the 2.1b.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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 the high value land for mixed residential and commercial and public space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#10031



Tell us why:

Move the port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#10031



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#10031



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?

Please increase the Gulf Harbour ferry services, buses are no substitute.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

More cycleways and increased frequency of public transportation.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10035



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think that the focus on public transportation is good, but I would like to see additional investment in cycling infrastructure. I have lived along the North Western cycleway and seen how providing this infrastructure empowers people to make transport choices that are better for themselves and our communities.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improving the connections between transport infrastructure, especially for pedestrians. Increasing the amount of safe, protected, cycleways. Further decreasing speed limits on local roads. Making roads safer by putting in crossings and traffic calming infrastructure.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Any increase in road capacity.

Spend less on consultation for a bike harbour crossing and just use the bridge we already have please.

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



#10035



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:

Central Auckland is currently a wash of luxury shopping and international food chains. Auckland Council could use this space to bring back some local expression to our most trafficked spaces. Please don't just make it into more commercial space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#10035



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Same as above.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#10035



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#10035



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

I support the continued betterment of community spaces like libraries and parks, and making sure that everyone can access these resources as well. Please consider how people will be getting to those spaces, and whether it is safe for them to do so as a pe

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#10035



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why



#10035



This area of Auckland is not very safe to travel through, because our speed limits are too high and many areas have inadequate crossings, separated paths, and protective infrastructure.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I think with all the revenue Council obtains through the thousands of apartments & dwellings in Auckland they should be able to budget without heavy borrowing. Please do not remove public rubbish bins from parks & beach parks.



#10039



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

We do not require any more speed bumps as there are too many as it is.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think Council should go back to Government & try to reintroduce the fuel tax which helped pay for things.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

At this time when most New Zealanders are finding the cost of living difficult I think prioritisation is paramount. Fixing the infrastructure is a National problem and Auckland needs to seriously check this as it's no good continuing to build more and more homes without addressing the infrastructure.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Not sure so no comment at this stage.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I have only been to the stadium once many years ago. I feel I am not experienced or knowledgeable enough to make comment on 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)?



#10039



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I am opposed to any further sale of the airport shares. There is no reason why we can't set up some sort of fund with all the rates Council receives. Any fund would need to be run independently.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I have listened to ideas and read ideas on the pros and cons of the future of Port of Auckland and I don't feel I have enough knowledge to decide.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Because I think that is practical.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

If a Future Fund were to be set up it is a must that it would be independently checked.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know



#10039



Tell us why:

I feel this needs proper consult and I don't know enough to offer my opinion.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

See my comments above for 5a.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	I don't know



#10039



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I feel this is quite complex and I have no idea about Waitākere water so how can I comment on rates for that area?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#10039



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and 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

It is important to keep on with upkeep for modes of transport.



#10039



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

There is a lot to achieve and to upgrade and maintain but it is possible.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I have answered questions in this submission to the best of my knowledge. There is a lot to process and far more to learn.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared 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 cycleways less raised pedestrian crossings



#10061



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

sounds as though road tolls are being considered need more information

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

if you want cars off the road and people onto public transport you need better connections to larger park n rides

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



#10061



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#10061



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#10061



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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	Not Important



#10061



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?

Do less (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?



#10076



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10076



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#10076



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.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10076



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	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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10134



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support making public transport and general transport easier, quicker, and cheaper for everyone. However, things like raised pedestrian crossings and cycle lanes are important to allow safe transport and encourage more environmentally friendly means of travel, as well as to potentially help with some of the traffic issues.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I would spend more on public transport as it is so important to help reach our city's full potential. Greater investment in public transport helps to make Auckland a better place to live, with greater accessibility around our city, lowering of cost of living (as transport cost can be a significant burden), and assisting the issues with traffic.

2b. 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:



#10134



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?



#10134



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#10134



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

WQTR: Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

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
---	----------------



#10134



Support 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?

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?



#10134



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).



#10134



Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	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?

i rather prefer Maurice Williamson's suggestion of - Do More With Less. To do that, you need to reverse/discard ACC Resolution number ENV/2019/72, (MOVED by



#10143



Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Member P Goff), and instead follow the science that says there is no climate emergency.

This would mean doing less activity towards Net Zero 2050 which in turn frees council funds up, eliminate costs involved and would enable Council to focus on its core activities.

Please remove the goals of 2030 50% net carbon and 2050 net zero. The costs of these and the staffing and reports that the goals generate are not in the Council's real purpose. This means deregistering from C40 cities and other related Climate Emergency campaign organisations.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is an asset us Aucklanders north of the bridge have invested in immensely and our community is not getting smaller! The lockdowns demonstrated the dire society benefit and need for buildings, stadiums and large gathering spaces to unite in cheering on a sports team, sing aloud with a rock band or share in other similar events together. Whatever it takes for it not to be sold off nor soaked into the already saturated town housing developments that deny truly uplifting community spirit.



#10143



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Council management of such a fund will no doubt be negligent and inefficient. It will end up costing ratepayers more.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Auckland Council has difficulty controlling the CCOs now - it would have no chance with an operator such as DP World.

The only reason a port operating company would operate the port is to make a profit and send the profit offshore. DP World's EBITA margin has exceeded 28% every year, often near 40%, and that profit goes to the private shareholders, in Dubai UAE. It is essential that the profit remains in Auckland, or at least in New Zealand. The upfront purchase cost of around NZD2 billion, which is tax deductible, also enables DP World to introduce their power over local logistics operators and extract more profit to Dubai. Even if another operator was selected, the effect would be the same.

The Australian experience shows that DP World has paid zero tax in Australia for at least the past eight years, and yet is highly profitable for its owners in Dubai; effectively the UAE government. It also pushes WEF and associated features.

We need to hold on to our NZ-paid assets.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#10143



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self-Insurance is a well established and proven system with cost benefit advantages. However, even without the Future Fund it is simple to accept higher excesses on claims, as we do with our personal insurances. It's not complicated.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

These two wharves can be used to enhance the ferry services in Auckland, which require expansion to improve green transport options. It is important that they do not become places for apartments or similar constructions.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Clean bulk cargoes are still required in Auckland, and also smaller ships are better operating here than at the specialist container terminal on Fergusson Wharf. Bulk cement operations for example work very well now at Bledisloe wharf.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	Support
---	---------



#10143



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#10143



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

CATTR is a misplaced target, and includes funding part of the “Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy”. A great strategy but should not be funded by a “transport” rate. It was initially set up in 2022 as CATR, the word ‘Transport’ seems to be added in 2024, as the only way to achieve ‘Net Zero’ is to offset the transport emissions by planting more trees to offset the Scope 3 emissions that are unavoidable.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus 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.

Very Important



#10143



Support 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.	Very Important

Tell us why

i agree we are a diverse community, and that vibrancy and creativity are worthy of support, however i do not believe council should support or fund the sexualised public display of certain rainbow advocates.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Feedback has only been open for just under one month, which for a plan and document of this size and consequence to our and our grandchildren's future is very limited. i work fulltime and as many public ratepayers like me, do not have the large staff or time that the council has. Please consider a more reasonable timeframe.

The resolution ENV/2019/72 itself states:

“c) note that climate change does not satisfy the definition of an “emergency” under the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002, and that a declaration of a “climate emergency” has no other inherent statutory or legal implications; however, such a declaration may further highlight Auckland Council’s belief in the importance and urgency of addressing climate change”
Which supports the premise/idea that this is about a belief, not science. It hangs on three things that the council want to **affirm**:

1. “The science is Irrefutable”.

This is simply incorrect. There is no 97% consensus.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexepstein/2015/01/06/97-of-climate-scientists-agree-is-100-wrong/?sh=6ed0af693f9f>

There are many reputable and eminent scientists saying there is no climate emergency; they are simply being cancelled. A healthy red team vs blue team debate is what is needed. But until that happens we should lead the way to climate sanity rather than lead the way over the net zero fiscal cliff.

No cost benefit analysis has been done by council, and according to Prof Michael Kelly to cover the basics to Net Zero would mean taking \$250,000 from each kiwi family. <https://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2022/03/Kelly-Net-Zero-Progress-Report.pdf>

Also, RCP8.5, that most of our planned actions and intended expenditures has been and continues to be based on, has been retracted/retraced/written off by the IPCC itself.

2. “the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Special Report in October 2018 stated that we have twelve years to turn greenhouse gas emissions around to limit global warming to the Paris Agreement target of 1.5-degrees, or face an uncertain future.”

The IPCC headline stories, that this is taken from, do not tell the truth of the IPCC scientific papers. They are purely politically not scientifically based.

The IPCC is famous for 10/12 year predictions that have not come true.

3. “everyone has a role to play in delivering the change required”.

Everyone indeed has a role to play. Our primary role is to seek the truth behind any given situation so that we can make solid decisions for ourselves and humanity. Your responsibility as councillors is to the ratepayers and the tenants of those ratepayers. We urge you to stand up and be world leaders rather than take us further down the path to financial Armageddon. You yourselves have completed no cost-benefit analysis. Prof Michael Kelly has worked out a basic Net Zero cost of \$550 Billion. Others say that is underestimated by at least \$200 Billion. At \$550 Billion that is a cost of \$250,000 per family. All to reduce 0.15% of global CO₂ emissions, which, as we have said, do not have consensus for being a control knob at all. i.e. \$250,000 per family for effectively a zero effect on global climate even if the CO₂ as a control knob of the climate theory is correct.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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.



#10148



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 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 6-14 yrs 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)?



#10148



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.



#10148



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#10148



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have 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 Lifesaving facilities are 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	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?

Remove the physical barriers on inner city cycle lanes & convert this road space to T2 or T3 vehicles during peak hours as the cycle lanes are underutilised and create traffic congestion. Cycles permitted to use concrete pathways in these areas.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10153



Cost reduction initiatives should include ALL ACC activities including the Maori Boards & associated structures/funding

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

remove dedicated cycle lanes & have more arterial routes dual lanes during peak travel times e.g. Whangaparaoa RD Hibiscus Coast.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Pedestrian crossings-paint only

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

North Shore is under resourced for major event venues

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 AIAL shares immediately while interest rates are at their peak



#10153



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Kick starts the fund

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Relocate the wharf dedicated to imported vehicles to an internal port e.g. Manukau

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#10153



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	



#10153



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cancel each and every expense related to the climate change "emergency". There is no emergency and the money wasted here could well be better spent on core issues. Please also cancel all "Net Zero" plans. Please also counsel central government to



#10158



reduce overall expenditure on Net Zero issues. Auckland will be heavily and adversely impacted if these plans go ahead.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10158



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to	



#10158



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#10158



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	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?

We suggest a fourth option under 1a - Do More With Less. (As Maurice Williamson suggests). We suggest you do that by reversing/discarding Auckland City Council Resolution number ENV/2019/72, MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by



#10159



Member P Goff, and instead follow the science that says there is no climate emergency.

This would mean doing less activity towards Net Zero 2050 and this would free council funds up and eliminate costs involved and enable council to focus on core activities.

Remove the goals of 2030 50% net carbon and 2050 net zero. The costs of these and the staffing and reports that the goals generate are not in the Council's real purpose. This means deregistering from C40 cities and other related Climate Emergency campaign organisations.

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?

Net Zero goals. Zero electrification

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



#10159



Tell us why:

Council management of such a fund will be negligent and not efficient. It will end up costing ratepayers more.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 only reason a port operating company, such as DP World, would operate the port is to make a profit and send the profit offshore. DP World's EBITA margin has exceeded 28% every year, often near 40%, and that profit goes to the private shareholders, in Dubai UAE. It is essential that the profit remains in Auckland, or at least in New Zealand. The upfront purchase cost of around NZD2 billion, which is tax deductible, also enables DP World to introduce their power over local logistics operators and extract more profit to Dubai. Even if another operator was selected, the effect would be the same.

The Australian experience shows that DP World has paid zero tax in Australia for at least the past eight years, and yet is highly profitable for its owners in Dubai; effectively the UAE government. It also pushes WEF and associated features.

Auckland Council has difficulty controlling the CCOs, it would have no chance with such an operator.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#10159



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self-Insurance is a well established and proven system with cost benefit advantages. However even without the Future Fund it is simple to accept higher excesses on claims, as we do with our personal insurances. It's not complicated.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

These two wharves can be used to enhance the ferry services in Auckland.. It is important that they do not become places for apartments or similar constructions.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Clean bulk cargoes are still required in Auckland, and also smaller ships are better operating here than at the specialist container terminal on Fergusson Wharf. Bulk cement operations for example work very well now at Bledisloe wharf.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#10159



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#10159



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

CATTR is a misplaced target, and includes funding part of the “Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy”. A great strategy but should not be funded by a “transport” rate. It was initially set up in 2022 as CATR, the word ‘Transport’ seems to be added in 2024, as the only way to achieve ‘Net Zero’ is to offset the transport emissions by planting more trees to offset the Scope 3 emissions that are unavoidable.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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.	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



#10159



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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.	
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 local power rather than centralising

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think we should be looking at doing more and paying less.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Feedback has only been open for just under one month, which for a plan and document of this size and consequence is very limited. The public ratepayers do not have the large staff that the council has.

The resolution ENV/2019/72, declaring a climate emergency, itself states in point c (Minutes copied below):

that climate change does not satisfy the definition of an “emergency” under the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002, and that a declaration of a “climate emergency” has no other inherent statutory or legal implications; however, such a declaration may further highlight Auckland Council’s belief in the importance and urgency of addressing climate change

Which supports the premise/idea that this is about a belief, not science.

It hangs on three things (that the council want to affirm.

1. “The science is Irrefutable”.

This is simply incorrect.

There is no 97% consensus. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexepstein/2015/01/06/97-of-climate-scientists-agree-is-100-wrong/?sh=6ed0af693f9f>

There are many reputable and eminent scientists saying there is no climate emergency. They are simply being cancelled. A healthy red team vs blue team debate is what is needed. But until that happens we should lead the way to climate sanity rather than lead the way over the net zero fiscal cliff. No cost benefit analysis has been done by council and according to Prof Michael Kelly to cover the basics would mean \$250,000 from each kiwi family. (This is the UK report. Don Nicholson says he has the NZ one <https://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2022/03/Kelly-Net-Zero-Progress-Report.pdf>

RCP8.5, that most of our planned actions and intended expenditures has been based on, has been retracted/retraced/written off by the IPCC itself.

2. “the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Special Report in October 2018 stated that we have twelve years to turn greenhouse gas emissions around to limit global warming to the Paris Agreement target of 1.5-degrees, or face an uncertain future.”

The IPCC headline stories, that this is taken from, do not tell the truth of the IPCC scientific papers. They are purely politically not scientifically based.

The IPCC is famous for 10/12 year predictions that have not come true.

3. “everyone has a role to play in delivering the change required”.

Everyone indeed has a role to play. Our primary role is to seek the truth behind any given situation so that we can make solid decisions for ourselves and humanity.

Your responsibility is to the ratepayers and the tenants of those ratepayers. We urge you to stand up and be world leaders rather than take us further down the path to financial armageddon. You yourselves have no cost-benefit analysis. Prof Michael Kelly has worked out a basic Net Zero cost of \$550 Billion. Others say that is an underestimate by at least \$200 Billion. At \$550 Billion that is a cost of \$250,000 per family. All to reduce 0.15% of global CO2 emissions, which, as we have said, do not have consensus for being a control knob at all. i.e. \$250,000 per family for effectively a zero effect on global climate even if the CO2 as a control knob of the climate theory is correct.

Here's the official declaration: (highlighting is mine)

**Komiti Taiao ā-Hapori Hoki /
Environment and Community
Committee**

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of the Environment and Community Committee held in the Reception Lounge, Auckland Town Hall, 301-305 Queen Street, Auckland on Tuesday, 11 June 2019 at 9.38am.

Resolution number ENV/2019/72

MOVED by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Member P Goff:

That the Environment and Community Committee:

- a) note that Auckland Council has long acknowledged the importance of and urgent need to address climate change for the benefit of current and future generations**
- b) note that Auckland Council already demonstrates leadership in the face of climate change, including incorporating climate change considerations into council's work programmes and decisions; working with regional partners to ensure a collaborative response; advocating and engaging with central government; and leading by example in reducing our in-house emissions**
- c) note that climate change does not satisfy the definition of an "emergency" under the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002, and that a declaration of a "climate emergency" has no other inherent statutory or legal implications; however, such a declaration may further highlight Auckland Council's belief in the importance and urgency of addressing climate change**
- d) note that further information on Auckland Council's recent and planned climate change response is provided in the attachments to this report**
- e) affirm the following statement:**

"Auckland Council recognises the importance of and urgent need to address climate change for the benefit of current and future generations:

- the science is irrefutable – climate change is already impacting ecosystems and communities around the world, with increasingly frequent and severe storms, floods and droughts; melting polar ice sheets; sea level rise and coastal inundation and erosion; and impacts on biodiversity including species loss and extinction.**
- the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Special Report in October 2018 stated that we have twelve years to turn greenhouse gas emissions around to limit global warming to the Paris Agreement target of 1.5-degrees, or face an uncertain future. This requires 'rapid and far-**

reaching transitions in energy, land, urban and infrastructure (including transport and buildings), and industrial systems '

(www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2018/07/sr15_headline_statements.pdf)

- everyone has a role to play in delivering the change required.

As such, Auckland Council declares a climate emergency and commits to:

- continue to robustly and visibly incorporate climate change considerations, in practical terms, into council work programmes and decisions
- continue to provide strong local government leadership in the face of climate change, including working with local and central government partners to ensure a collaborative response
- continue to advocate strongly for greater central government leadership and action on climate change
- continue to increase the visibility of our climate change work
- continue to lead by example in monitoring and reducing council's greenhouse gas emissions
- include climate change impact statements on all committee reports
- requesting staff of council-controlled organisations to include climate change impact statements in their committee reports

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No, you have so much money, manage it better.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

User pays.



#10160



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Just sort out the motorway... traffic congestion.

And manage your money better.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

The motorways - making more lanes.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raising speed humps

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 not utilised enough now as it is, it could be used 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Waste of money



#10160



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#10160

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#10160



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Not Important



#10160



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

Seriously is this all they have some up with?

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not much

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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.



#10172



- 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)?



#10172



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.



#10172



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#10172



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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



#10172



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.”

e. Complete Your Details. Feel free to confirm you are submitting the response on behalf of Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club.



#10172



1. In addition to answering the questions on surf club redevelopment funding per above, if you wish to respond on other aspects of the LTP, please do so but ensure when you complete Your Details, select No to “Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation or business?”.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	As proposed
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More indoor basketball stadiums.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10173



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This land could be used in a far more productive way, adding value to the local community rather than costing the council money.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#10173



We should look at moving the port rather than locking the port into its current location for another 35 years. The waterfront land could be used far more efficiently to provide value to the CBD.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#10173



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#10173



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10173



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

The priorities seem to focus on advocating for things and not actually doing things. Although the items they are advocating for are all important it would be good to see priorities on things that can actually be done by the local board.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

All of the above

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10186



Less mayoral advisor people

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It's all important but there is not enough emphasis on cycleways

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways -one from the North Shore to town like the Western one, also one South

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Its an underused facility and hasn't got a great main field and now Moana Pacific can't play there, would like to see really good games there-Warriors for example, just one game!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Do not sell more shares!



#10186



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 agree with the mayor and the Future Fund at all

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

See above

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 community things at the port but not at the detriment of the port operations, a working port and the SEEPORT events etc are really good

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#10186



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#10186



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No change to pools and leisure, we have a childhood obesity issue already, don;t make more barriers to access! Also the venues our group hires aren't great and unless better maintained and upgraded why should we pay more? Charges to film companies-may directly affect local creatives and crew who work for them so really needs looking at, it's not as simple as charge the flash film companies as they employ locals (or, make part of the deal that they are using a degree of local creatives and crew if they don't already), and what about small local productions and NZ productions-we need to support the Arts sector more not price Auckland out of being used. Our iconic places in a film bring tourists.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10186



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

Also, bring back the Long Bay signs that we were very proud of, stick library lost and found and toys, support the local group, I don't belong to it but I was so proud that our community looked after the beach, got items back to owners etc. It was soooo disappointing that "non compliant signs" ruined the local pride we had for that. So sad and bureaucratic. If you don't live here and use the beach nearly every day you don;t understand how heartwarming it was to see. Visitors remarked on it and we all looked



#10186



after it. It was just a really bad decision to ditch it and disrespect those people who were helping clean the beach too. I got stuff back that I had dropped on beach, it worked! It was an example of community coming together and speaks to resilience to a degree actually.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Pretty good but even more emphasis on engagement with local iwi needed and local solutions for things, local resilience is good but should be holistic view on resilience not just a disaster situation.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do 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?



#10192



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#10192



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know



#10192



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#10192



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cultural development / funding major events - let the free market handle that



#10262



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Invest more in public transport and less in cars.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

A smaller all seater stadium, focused on football and rugby for max 10,000 people.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port to Whangarei



#10262



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#10262

Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#10262



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Fairly Important



#10262



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	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No new cycleways, raised crossings, speed bumps till potholes are fixed



#10278



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support the capped weekly public transport costs, time of use charging - seen it in other countries and works, dynamic lanes are great and also work to improve congestion. Don't really see the point of the CLR in the city - too late now, but expensive to build and maintain. Would have been better to do above ground LR like other countries.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport options - increase ferries again from places like Gulf Harbour

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways, no traffic lights onto motorway - doesn't make any difference to motorway and blocks local roading system

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

There's limited medium sized venues in region - can cater to specific events, sports etc. It's underutilised, so staying as is, isn't really an option and big events don't seem to want to go there, even though it's easier to access than Mt Smart & more parking!!!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#10278



Tell us why:

I see the value of an Akl futures scheme, but think should retain ownership of airport shares.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I would prefer to keep management with council group but needs better management. Why isn't it operating 24 hrs like other ports? Do the unions have too much control? If can't make it earn more, then leasing would be the next best option.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 can be redeveloped for commercial or residential use, could generate additional income. However I wouldn't support the building of a public park in the space - it would need to provide income stream, otherwise stay with port.



#10278



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

If we're going to reduce port operations and increase use of rail/trucks would just increase congestions and costs anyway. Might as well close ort and shift freight to other NZ location! Freight companies already struggle with delays in unloading and non 24 hr operation.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#10278



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#10278



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The only priority they can make a decision on is Orewa Beach protection projects - doesn't seem like much!! Priority is transport (which they don't have any control over)-



#10278



buses & ferries. Need ++ advocacy - is so congested and can take 30 mins to get along peninsula. NX1 & 2 bus services are great, but no taxi's, limited ubers and no ferries in weekend really restricts people.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10283



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:

It is not working effectively

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:



#10283



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#10283



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#10283



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10283



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do 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?

Public facilities and free services should be reduced



#10294



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It can improve the convenience of public transportation and reduce transportation costs, including daily tickets, weekly tickets, monthly tickets and other capped transportation services.

For large-scale transportation projects that require huge amounts of money to build, try to reduce them as they should be suspended in the current situation of insufficient funds.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Spending on water, electricity and internet should be increased

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Various consulting fees and council staff need to be streamlined

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It is still usable now, and we will do it again when we have sufficient funds in the future

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#10294



Because you can get benefits as soon as possible, especially in the current situation of insufficient funds.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Can improve the current city council income, just lease

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

It can reduce the burden on citizens

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 hope to make good use of it and maximize the benefits and income.



#10294



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

This option can be considered, but it needs to be supervised

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support



#10294



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and 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?



#10294



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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?

Do less (reduce 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?

Pay down debt levels to become more financial savvy and sustainable.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10306



Tighten up spending on unnecessary expenditure. Bring down budgets and change the culture within the council of spending every dollar of a certain budget.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland's transport is so far behind times that something needs to be done. Unnecessary spending hasn't help. Auckland isn't a place to cycle long distances... it's just not safe to do so. Maintain roads and public transport first. Make public transport affordable and more readily available. Cars are the way at the moment in Auckland and that says a lot about the public transport system.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Affordable public transport that is more readily available. Otherwise you are throwing money away and cars will always be the bets and only reliable source of transport in Auckland.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Smaller minority groups needs. Auckland needs to be one big group and not made up of smaller groups demanding this and that.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

The North Shore is a growing area and needs a proper sports precinct. More resources are needed to bring this area up to a world class standards that all Aucklanders would enjoy and then it would attract bigger and better sporting events in the future which would help the economy.



#10306



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Need to work out a better way other than selling assets to help with debt levels and future spending. Be better at spending now and save for the future instead of selling away assets which will never be brought back in the future.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Work smarter not harder. Implement a plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Don't need a Auckland Future Fund, just need to be smarter with spending, pay down debt levels and become financially sustainable.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#10306



Do not proceed with the Future Fund. Setting this up will cost money that can be saved and/or spent appropriately.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	Do not support



#10306



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.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	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



#10306



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.	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



#10306



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Priorities how money is spent. Don't just spend for the sake of spending the money.
Less debt is best and plan for the future by working smarter not harder.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increase transport options for Whangaparoa including more ferry to and from Gulf Harbour

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10312



Cultural initiatives

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#10312



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#10312



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#10312



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Fairly Important



#10312



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

Need more feet options in the area specifically to and from Gulf Harbour including weekends

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Need increased feet sailings to and from Gulf Harbour including weekends

8. Do you have any other comments?

Need increased feet sailings to and from Gulf Harbour including weekends



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Upgrade mairangi bay Surf Club. The north shore city council had funds earmarked for this decades ago. Then it got mixed in with Auckland Council and there has been nothing done since.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10399



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

do less raised pedestrian crossings and speed bumps very expensive, regular speed bumps and normal crossings fine

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

the eastern link get more traffic away from motorway south and maybe auckland will keep moving better

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

buses don't need electric buses and also how about smaller buses for the feeder routes or timetable routes better for busy times not slow times

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

keep the stadium, we will never get another but sell off some land around it if required try and add value to the stadium use make it user friendly, ie don't need to open the whole stadium to use the ground

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:



#10399



think the council need to retain some ownership in infrastructure like the airport but agree the interest can be reduced to inves in ithier things provided the costs dont exceed the benefit want less bureacracy not more

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

we need an income stream to cover costs of operation

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 land/ wharf area is a area of significant access to the harbour and I think it should be utilised by greater public use including the possiblity of a stadium and some open park areas



#10399



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

as above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support



#10399



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#10399



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

pretty good we need to protect our parks and communities and surf clubs are vital to that



#10399



8. Do you have any other comments?

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



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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.



#10423



- 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:



#10423



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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?



#10423



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#10423



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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



#10423



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

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.”



#10423



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?

The MBSLC has continued to grow. the clubrooms are no longer fit for purpose and it is vital that they are upgraded to continue to meet the needs of the community. there were funds allocated in the local councils years ago, we ask these be utilised to improve the community resource of MBSLC



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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?



#10492



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways and traffic management for silly "fix its"

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10492



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#10492



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10492



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	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



#10492



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

We request the local board increase spending on sport and recreation so there is greater participation and community activity. We do not support greater charges as this will only lead to a decrease in participation and a decline in community spirit.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We support the increase of \$35 million into sport and recreation facilities across the local board and an increase in the development contribution for community sport and recreation programs.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?



#10552



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)?

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?



#10552



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	I don't know



#10552



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10552



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do 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?

Less support for commercial and business interests.



#10562



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

the council management is set up to fail, costs to use the stadium facilities are beyond local groups. Note that the previous local management group ran it at a profit.

Redevelopment is a device for the mayor to sell off most of the land - and we lose a community asset. This mayor is intent on selling community assets to his fellow neoliberal mates.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 mayor was put in by organised block voting of neoliberal groups like Atlas network, nz initiative, ratepayers union. They were successful because of the apathy of most Aucklanders.



#10562



Mayor Brown's task was to deliver the community assets over to rightwing investors - hence the proposed sale of airport shares and longterm rental of ports of Auckland. This is the opposite of benefitting the ratepayers of Auckland!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 for 35 years is a scam by mayor brown and his mates to pocket council income that rightly belongs to the people of Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

use it for council services - the Future Fund is a scam to privatise our assets.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

keep the port and land in council ownership - no tricky dealings please mayor.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:



#10562



the public might get a little benefit despite the council giving commercial/residential interests most of the space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't trust Mayor Brown - I don't know what he has planned.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support



#10562



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#10562



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

fix the dangerous Glenvar / East coast rd intersection



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10637



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#10637



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#10637



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10637



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	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



#10637



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

I don't know

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?

make all suburban roads 2 way by only allowing parking on one side of the road.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10640



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?

create 2 way at all times on suburban roads - have parking on 1 side only to allow this

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:

redeveloping in truth means selling lots of land.

the current managment is useless, its overpriced so the commuity can't afford to use it.
Bring back the previous managment we ran it well.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I don't trust Mayor Brown - he is aligned to neoliberal groups who aim is getting their hands on public assets - like airport shares and auck port longterm lease

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#10640



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 give our Port to the neoliberals - the incomes belongs to the people of Auckland.
Don't let them steal our 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:

Its our income ! dont let the mayor give it to his mates.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Future Fund is a scam

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#10640



Tell us why:

Dont trust mayor brown

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#10640



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#10640



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

fixing the very very dangerous Glenvar/east coast rd intersection

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



#10643



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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.



#10643



- 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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook 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	
---	--



#10643



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	



#10643



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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?



#10672



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:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?



#10672



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#10672



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	



#10672



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10672



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	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10682



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Greater benefits for local 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?

Tell us 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:



#10682



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	



#10682



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#10682



8. Do you have any other comments?

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I/We support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I/We support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?

Do the basic's but do it right, infrastructure needs to solid and work

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10688



enough cycle ways and pedestrian crossings for now put it into getting AKL moving with better service, reliability and choice.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Buses are not the best option for everyone. We have a ferry service at Gulf Harbour when it was working with a full timetable took hundreds of cars off the roads. Now they are all back on the roads causing more congestion. The Penlink won't solve this problem. Plus the funding for the station at Stanmore Bay has gone. It is a 50 min ferry ride, no congestion and a stressfree way to travel. By Car at least 1 hour and by bus 1. hour 40. Why would you cap everyone else's fares and make those who live further out pay a premium?

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Upgrade our ferry service at Gulf Harbour. Don't put in more speed bumps and cameras that will just slow things down even more.

Build parking buildings for park and ride so more people can use public transportation, not charge them also to park there to use their buses. People will find it cheaper and more convenient to take their own car - thus putting more cars on the roads again.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle ways and pedestrian crossings, cameras.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#10688



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

You can only sell things once to cover debt, there must be a better way!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 again with leasing the ports for 35 years you loose the opportunity to make more money for AKL

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#10688



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#10688



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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	Very Important
--	----------------



#10688



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?

1b. 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?



#10702



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

To do away with this asset would be incompetent - presumably corrupt

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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?



#10702



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook 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.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#10702



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#10702



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	
Environment and regulation	Do more
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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

reduce funding for Mayors office and trimming other parts of Council admin.



#10729



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think Ak Transport has done a great job to encourage a reliable bus/train service. The focus of increasing road speed limits across the region increases fuel consumption and increases risk to non vehicle transport, such as pedestrian and cyclists.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Raised pedestrian crossings have been pivotal to improving safety for elderly, for parents of children in pushchairs and people in mobility scooters.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

For safety reasons, I support the temporary traffic measures.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The airport is a strategic asset, best retained for the future.

A future entity -undefined- may not have any responsibility to the ratepayers.



#10729



An asset which contributes revenue to the city should be retained over time.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Relocate the port and retain ownership of the land.

Do not grant the port power to further encroach into Auckland Harbour.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

I do not support the Future Fund - a nebulous concept without published checks and balances.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

It appears to be an under-used public resource which could be enjoyed by the public.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#10729



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

The Harbour area should be used by everyone, not just commercial interests.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support



#10729



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#10729



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Very Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

After experiencing 3 local downpour events, I strongly support all natural networks and community networks development and protection.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#10729



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support the objectives of the Hibiscus Coast and Bays Local Board.

As a resident, I am so fortunate to be able to enjoy beautiful natural space via paths and networks already developed. Future strengthening of local community support is critical for developing resilience and skills in uncertain times in terms of climate change and city intensification.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

libraries especially in northshore, there is poor library infrastructure in Northshore, only one in Takapuna and in Albany and Brownsbay. love to have more library in campbell's Mairangi, Rothesday, Murray's area

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10744



no more roads needed and pedestrian crossings.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Why stop lightrail Project. so much money already spent to develop. Money wasted for no outcome.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

more parking spaces "park and ride" in northshore, build a parking building on top of exisitng lots. Currently, the competition to park the car at 6-7am is not discouraging people to bus to city.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#10744



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#10744



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#10744



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: 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.



#10765



- 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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#10765



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



#10765



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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,	



#10765



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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

Very Important



#10765



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

“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.”



#10765



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#10791



- 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)?



#10791



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.



#10791



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#10791



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have 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 less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10798



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:



#10798



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#10798



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#10798



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10798



options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do 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?

less money spent on specific Maori outcomes which use everyone's rates but target a small portion of Auckland. Less money spent on climate action, climate emergency, decarbonisation which do not use all the science available and achieve nothing



#10803



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

do not support the electrification roll out. Where is the money to upgrade the electricity network to cope with that coming from? More rates increase probably

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

easing congestion on the roads. Many people don't have the option to use public transport eg tradies, couriers etc and our roads are constantly clogged

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cycle & walk 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:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?



#10803



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 only benefit would be if the whole of the port operation was moved out of downtown Auckland

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

there are already public spaces in downtown Auckland. Growth in the form of housing should be encouraged elsewhere as the city centre is already congested

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#10803

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#10803



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our 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



#10803



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?

there doesn't seem to be any option to reduce council spending on staffing levels and efficiency. I have attended meetings where 3/4 on the time is wasted on opening and closing chats and icebreakers



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?



#10819



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I dont trust your agenda

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

all

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:



#10819



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 brainer

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

No brainer

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 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



#10819



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#10819



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	I don't know
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	I don't know
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	I don't know



#10819



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.	I don't know
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	I don't know

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Bring back waste bins - give people jobs that do actual work and pay them a living wage.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10855



Get rid of so many 'top tier' management services. - and reduce the salaries that are public service - ie cap them at less than \$100k. Sell the public golf courses to generate money for all Aucklanders to utilise.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Current public bus and train services are overpriced and unreliable - these basic things need fixing first.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Better bus drivers (by offering a living wage and realistic working hours) Reduce cost of bus and train fares.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Golf courses - sell them. Stop raised pedestrian crossings.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Either utilise the stadium better by encouraging its use for big events or sell some of it (or all of it)

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#10855



Tell us why:

Keep the shares in Auckland Airport. Sell the Golf Courses (why is this never an option on the Auckland Council proposals?)

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Retain ownership and operation of the port. Sell the Golf courses.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Yes please put more information on Auckland Council Golf Courses on your forms and options for them to be sold to generate more money for the Council.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#10855



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#10855



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#10855



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?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10879



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10879



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	



#10879



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10879



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 reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Not Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and	Not Important



#10879



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?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	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.	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



#10879



Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Not Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Not Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

What is very disappointing is no mention of the Orewa seawall and protection of the Orewa Beach area. Council have spent a lot of money todote achieving nothing.

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?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	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 new housing development until infra-structure catches up.



#10909



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

A.T. is a quango that needs to be scrapped, full of P.C. direction and nonsense. Should either be incorporated into Auckland Council or Waka Kotahi.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Given the North shore & environs have doubled in population since it was built a requirement for the facility clearly exists. Co-ordination with various other sporting bodies need to be improved.

Vanity projects like a new harbour stadium need to be kicked into touch!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#10909



Tell us here:

Move the port outside of Auckland city as our current road and rail network is overstretched.

Marsden Point is one option. We don't need to make Auckland any bigger - the bulk of the country lies empty!

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#10909



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#10909



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays, Waitematā

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#10909



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

More focus needs to be maintaining what we have already rather some nice to have P.C. initiatives.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Mostly OK

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Not Important
---	---------------



#10909



Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Fairly Important
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	Not Important
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Not Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important
Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Fairly Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitematā proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?



#10917



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:

North Harbour Cricket Ground

This is an exciting opportunity to convert North Harbour Stadium into a premier cricket ground that is able to host cricket matches at all levels; while retaining its ability to host provincial and international rugby, rugby league, football, as well as concerts and many other events.

Why cricket?

There is no international standard cricket ground in Auckland, New Zealand's largest city. This is an embarrassment and is detrimental to the development of cricket as the summer sport of choice for boys and girls in Auckland.

I played cricket, my sons both play cricket, and we watch cricket on tv all the time; but we and many other cricket fans that we know do not attend any cricket matches at Eden Park. The ground is too small which makes the outcome of the game often a lottery with poor and mis-timed shots often being rewarded with a boundary. Not cricket. The location of Eden Park in the middle of a residential suburb also makes it difficult to get to.

Why North Harbour Cricket Ground?

- The North harbour Cricket Ground is located in a light industrial / retail area with ample car parking.
- There are extensive retail and dining options in the immediate area.



#10917



- There is an adjacent world class aquatic centre.
- There is a transport hub (bus station) within easy walking distance of the ground.
- The Northern motorway is very close to the ground and there are multiple options for accessing the motorway.
- The main grandstand already exists which includes changing rooms, function rooms and broadcasting facilities.
- There is an existing “Number two” ground adjacent to the main ground.

What needs to be done?

- Continue the removal of the existing West Stand.
- Convert the existing playing surface into an International standard cricket ground, with two removable drop in pitches.
- Build a grass bank around the ground akin to Bay Park and Hagley Oval.
- Build a Media Centre at the north western side of the ground.
- Schedule some matches.
- Watch the crowds flow in.
- Pat yourselves on the back for doing the right thing.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#10917



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that

I don't know



#10917



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#10917



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10978



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10978



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Support



#10978



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10978



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#10978



other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10984



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:



#10984



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#10984



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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



#10984



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Very Important



#10984



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.	Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve climate resilience of infrastructure and public spaces. Support more mixed public transport improve park and ride, bike and scooter access. Allow trucks and large commercial vehicles to use transport lanes



#11077



1d. Is there anything else 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 funding for pedestrian public transport cyclists and scooters because they unclog the roads for the remaining cars and busses. But we don't want to die doing it.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making park n ride parking more efficient. Plans for multi story. Support bikes and scooters to have safe park n ride lockups and Carry on scooter racks.

Storm water affecting sewage overflow, improve black water infrastructure. Increase drainage and diversions for flood affected areas with housing. . Our oceans are our bigger attractions and we are making them unswimable.

2b. 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:

Vector feels like a sports only stadium and doesn't look good for 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



#11077



Tell us why:

We can't ever buy it back if we sell it. It is critical infrastructure and a source of future revenue.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

We are limiting our future revenue for a payout today. Short term thinking

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 livability of Auckland will be reduced if Auckland council continues cutting 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:



#11077



Will increase the value of Auckland as a destination and livable city

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Reducing port capacity can have huge supply chain issues if there is an adverse event as we saw in the last few years. We can't reduce capacity so we are dependent on other cities ports.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Do not support



#11077



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Agree on fairer more equitable funding at level 5. Why is there not apparently a direct question on this?

Increasing leisure centre costs will reduce use in many areas. Making it a wealthy privilege not a community resource. Fitter Aucklanders cost less to our other services.

Targeted rates will further create inequality so that rich areas receive better funded amenities. It is the council's role to provide equal access to amenities and amenity maintenance and development across Auckland.

Funding the rail link is important because all Aucklanders and Auckland businesses benefit from reducing road congestion.



#11077



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Very Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important



#11077



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

Saves on road infrastructure and allows the community to use more multi mode, bike electric aand public transport. Improves our health and well-being. Walkable cities. 2

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Why is there no page number links to this information and no searchable links in the long term plan and supporting information? I am finding very difficult to find the Hibiscus coast 10 year plan. This seems like deliberate obscuring of the references to influence people to give up on giving feedback on the financial and long term planning.

Agree on the fairer and more equitable allocation of funding. Level 5

Disagree with targetted rates that increase inequality between areas of Auckland.

Agree with goals of the Hibiscus Coast local board. Especially climate mitigation. And protecting the historic pohutakawa along Orewa Beach that we are losing.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements.

Very Important



#11077



Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners.	Very Important
Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community.	Very Important
Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme.	Very Important
Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Needs to increase climate mitigation for residents developers and facilities as shown by floodviewer and other council research.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The supporting documents and ltp were not properly linked and searchable.

The level of shift to the equitable funding model (in the supporting documents described as 1 status quo to 5 more equitable) was not directly asked in a question.

Increased fees for council leisure centre's and facilities was hidden in the supporting documents. This will likely influence these results.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	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?

Urgent need to fund and upgrade surf lifesaving facilities.



#11099



1d. Is there anything else 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)?

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?



#11099



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to	



#11099



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#11099



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	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



#11099



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Must prioritise the finalisation of the review of the 2015 Reserve Management Plan so that ant development project can proceed impeded.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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.



#11102



- 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)?



#11102



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.



#11102



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#11102



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.
- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.

Very Important



#11102



Support 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

“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 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?

Deliver the basics

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11124



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#11124



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#11124



we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#11124



6b. Do you have 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 time and money

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	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I don't see that we have a choice but to speed up investment in transport services and climate resilience because if we don't, it is likely to cost the Council and probably also Central Government more when natural disasters occur. No more procrastination. Even if you go for the lower rates rises, there is no guarantee you will be able to stick



#11140



with them. Are you really going to drop to 3% next year - won't this have to be clawed back later? Pity Three Waters was cancelled, it would have been very helpful for the 10 year plan.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes, stop making weird decisions in planning; it seems you need more diversity in your planning teams.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Please don't cut cycle ways otherwise it will become a self-fulfilling prophecy that they are not used that much. I would like to cycle more but not when the roads are not designed safely enough for cyclists.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

#2 only if it really is going to be redeveloped to better suit the needs of the community. I hope there would be local consultation.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#11140



Other

Tell us why:

If you could establish an Auckland Future Fund with the guarantee that you would not sell AIAL shares, rather keep the shares out of the Fund but funnel earnings from the shares to build the Auckland Future Fund, then ok. I do not trust that managers of the Fund won't sell off the shares for short term gain. You've already sold some of the shares, and history is repeating itself within a year.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

It's crazy to let go of valuable assets like the POAL especially as it is producing good financial returns. The option you suggest below is the one that makes sense to me:

Alternatively, these financial returns from POAL (and any capital distributions from the port) could be invested into the Auckland Future Fund, noting that this would require even higher rates increases or more cuts to council services.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

The Auckland Future Fund could use the dividends to improve infrastructure where needed. But not by selling off or leasing the POAL.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#11140



If the POAL is producing financial returns that could build the Future Fund, then it doesn't make any sense to sell off this valuable asset. It doesn't seem necessary to sell.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Provided there is really careful planning and innovative thinking to ensure the significant future financial benefit 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:

Provided there is really careful planning and innovative thinking to ensure the significant future financial benefit for the Council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#11140



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#11140



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I am happy with the rates funded food scraps service because I use it a lot and it has made a huge difference to how often I have my rubbish bin emptied. I only have my rubbish bin emptied once a month or less; recycling bin once a month or less. So I would prefer the pay as you go for the rubbish bin.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#11140



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

They include important environmental and social factors, as well as modes of transport other than cars.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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?



#11153



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No, however, while these aims are excellent, they do not seem to be achievable given the governments proposals which appear to be counterproductive.

2b. 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:

For more productive use of the area, in a more productive way.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 preferable to retain our own assets, do not sell off any more of NZ enabling any more profits to leave the country.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#11153



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#11153



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#11153



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	Fairly Important



#11153



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?

Agree

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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 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 funding for more 'Heavy Rail' lines across Auckland, for likes of Dominion RD or even to the North Shore. Britomart is the Transport Centre of Auckland, it needs to be bigger by adding more 'rail lines' and become a centralised area so it bring connivence to commuters. It would make more ideal sense and more practical sense to do than



#11184



'Surfaced Light Rail' do to the complexities it faces. It would free up the buses on existing routes to create new routes in Auckland.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

We shouldn't be regenerating urban suburbs likes of Dominion RD for projects like 'Surface Light Rail', requires road to be widened, to cater both private vehicles and light rail, meaning land available for developers, brings 'mass population growth' all at once, cause of linear clusters of developments being undertaken which results in high rates of crime. Also it results in 'ultra low property market and 'ultra low rent rates' in linear clusters once developments finish. If there were to be more 'Surface Light Rail', for example an another line like in Sandringham RD or Mt Eden RD. Effect would be 'ultra low property market and 'ultra low rent rates' would be there to stay for longer and high crime rates will stay longer too.

Once likes of Dominion RD becomes a 'ultra low property market and 'ultra low rent market', people from middle, high income would take full advantage. It becomes a loophole for them to escape participating in society, by becoming more lazier, not undertake higher job positions, while people from low income backgrounds continue to struggle. They just earn by 'privilege', not based by 'hard-work'. Is that equal society?

Take Melbourne, VIC, Australia as good example, known for its Light Rail across Melbourne, known for 'ultra low property market and ultra low rent market', known for mass developments of high intensification, becoming highest populated city in Australia overtaking Sydney, lastly known for lastly highest crime rates across Australia. Also known for NZ'er fleeing to Melbourne cause of 'ultra low property market and ultra low rent market' so they can escape participating in society, taking easy way in life. We don't want to turn into Melbourne!

'Tunnelled Heavy Rail' would be ultimate solution to combating these issues, be underground, won't be touching much surface except where station going to be located. Any form of 'Heavy Rail' would be more faster, more direct, avoids traffic lights, time saving and more convenient. Won't be having negative effects on business, commuters, community and society.

If not Tunnelled Heavy Rail, Surfaced Heavy Rail would be ideal option, of course would face Land Acquisition of private properties. But it won't be creating Linear clusters of development cause the land occupying will be smaller and only being used for 'Heavy Rail'.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11184



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Nothing to say

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Building more resilient Transport projects like more Busways, Bus Lanes, more Heavy Rail lines to displace buses, so existing buses can be used onto new routes.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Need to spend more on public transport!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Lived on the North Shore for 23 years and doesn't make sense in keeping the stadium due to facility not getting regularly used by existing tenant.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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



#11184



Tell us 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:

Nothing to Say

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Nothing to Say

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Building a football stadium of 25,000-30,000 seated for Football (soccer) future A-League team, some Rugby League (Auckland Warriors), Rugby Union(All Blacks lower tier matches). Eden Park but expand north, east and west stands, with capacity 70,000 seats, hosting rugby (Auckland Rugby Union/Blues Rugby/All Blacks matches),



#11184



Cricket(Auckland Cricket/Blackcaps) concerts, national teams in Football(Soccer) and Rugby League. Building a 25,000-30,000 seated Waterfront Stadium would be more convenient for people taking PT from Britomart since its less than 2-3 mins walk than placed a stadium at either Wynyard or Quay Park, it be 20 mins or so walk to the stadium which isn't ideal for everyone or even people with mobility issues.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	I don't know



#11184



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Nothing to Say

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nothing Else



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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?

I support further investment into a surface light rail rapid transit network starting with a route from the City Centre to Mt Roskill, and then further expansion to Onehunga, Māngere and other transport corridors such as the North-Western and Northern corridor. Any busway development along the North-Western corridor should be future-



#11205



proofed for surface light rail upgrades. Consistent work over the last decade, reflected in Auckland Transport's Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report, has shown that to effectively address Auckland's congestion issues we cannot rely solely on a bus network. The busiest bus corridors in our city are already reaching capacity, and the long-term plan should reflect that reality.

Additionally, I support Auckland controlling its own transport priorities. An "Auckland Deal" provides the means for central government to support Auckland Council's priorities, rather than the other way around. A surface light rail network would provide opportunities for growth, development, and productivity in the city. I believe this should be included in the "Auckland Deal" with central government. I urge Auckland Council and the Mayor to make the development of a surface light rail network, starting with the City Centre to Mt Roskill line, a priority in such a deal.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I do not fully support this plan as it does not include investment and commitment to a surface light rail rapid transit network. Any work on a busway in the North-Western corridor should be future proofed for surface light rail and there should be commitment to surface light rail along the City Centre to Mangere corridor, starting with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line. I worry without this we will not be able to address Auckland's congestion issues as projected growth in these corridors would require higher capacity transport modes such as surface light rail.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I want to see Auckland Council spending more to develop a surface light rail network, with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line constructed as a priority. There has been significant design work done by Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi on surface light rail pre-2019. Adopting these plans will allow any work to be fast tracked with only minor updates and improvements needed. From this stage I would support expansion of surface light rail, such as what is proposed in Auckland Transport's Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report. The line should be expanded to Onewa and Mangere,



#11205



and eventually to other transport corridors such as the North-Western or Northern corridors, upgrading any busway infrastructure. Staging the development of the network in this way ensures it remains affordable for Aucklanders and is practical to build.

Congestion is a major issue in our city that costs Aucklanders time and money. It restricts our growth and potential. Consistent work done over the last decade has shown that we cannot only rely on our bus network in our busiest corridors in order to address our cities transport issues. Surface light rail provides a higher capacity solution that is affordable, deliverable, environmentally friendly, and will connect communities in Auckland. It provides a plethora of economic benefits that will create jobs and help businesses while improving our streetscapes to make our city a better place to live.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Retain this as a large events venue for the surrounding area, which is growing in population

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Prefer Council not to sell off assets

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#11205



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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	
---	--



#11205



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#11205



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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.	Fairly Important



#11205



Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future 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?

Approve of priorities, especially advocacy for completion of Glenvar Road/East Coast Bays Road improvements, which is increasingly necessary with the development of the Long Bay Village Centre, and other transport-related projects (Whangaparāoa Transport Interchange, upgrades and reopening of Vaughans Road and Okura River Road, Gulf Harbour Ferry route)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Focus on core services and drop spending on cultural events and any other free events

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11222



As above

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop wasting money on cycle ways and lanes. Only a small percentage of population will ever cycle on any good day. This is NZ not Netherlands. 4 seasons in 1 day and not flat

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Ferry services. Auckland is surrounded by water. Not sure why this is not used more

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Redoing footpaths

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?



#11222



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

Investment in core services

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#11222



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#11222



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our 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



#11222



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

Focus on core services first before nice to have

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Implementation of high speed rail infrastructure for commercial port cargo and passenger transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11228



Cut all spending and subsidies for commercial sport and athletics venues.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Get a proper rail system already. The cost will be worth it.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rail system expansions.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Cut all funding for a sport stadium. Use the money for more useful things.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Long term value beats short term sales.



#11228



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Long term value is better.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 need to use the money when there are more important things to spend it on.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#11228

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#11228



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Very Important



#11228



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 more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do 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?

Upgrade the waste and storm water and roading infrastructure.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11234



Spend the money wisely and not on speed bumps or re-branding / new signage unless absolutely necessary. Spend money from developers on improving infrastructure.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think its important to keep our roading network maintained as it will end up costing much more if we dont. I believe there are some key Road linking projects that will help Aucklanders move around their city easier and im not a fan of all the money being spent on cycle ways and walkways.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Getting a second harbour crossing sorted. Getting a 4 lane highway the length of the nation. Maintaining key roading infrastructure.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less on new signs and rebranding departments. Less red tape and traffic management requirements for active work sites.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

By making the stadium more accessable and holding more events it will create more economic benefits for the surrounding businesses and give the paeople in the area more community events to attend as well as creating more jobs in the area as a on flow affect.



#11234



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Establishing a fund that is independently managed and spreads its risk across many different types of investments is a great idea as this will allow us to do major projects and invest in other areas as those investments mature or generate returns. Having the Auckland Airport go fully private may make it more profitable in the long run

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Given the port is already running close to capacity i cant see where you would be able to make any further revenue. By doing the 35 year lease option we get a much needed capital injection and can renegotiate later down the line

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 will need the profits & dividends to maintain the current level of service and keep the city running. Eg waste manangement, Parks & Recreation,

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#11234



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 potential for these wharfs to be turned into high value commercial property for leasing or for other uses that could help attract more tourism and generate more money for the council and surrounding 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 would like to see the site used for a new Stadium site.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	Support



#11234



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#11234



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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.	Fairly Important



#11234



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	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?

Marine Biosecurity - caulerpa and other pests

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11239



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:



#11239



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#11239



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	



#11239



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#11239



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	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1 Stop all the sewage polluting the sea and rivers.

2 Fine developers thousands of dollars for the clay pollution of our sea which is now a cloudy, clay mess. Not the pathetic \$300 as current so they don't bother.



#11244



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Concentrate on the core business.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Don't need 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)?

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?



#11244



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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

I don't know



#11244



the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#11244



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	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?

Investing in the NETR to ensure conservation activities like pest control and regeneration continue to happen in priority areas like regional parks as well as supporting grass roots conservation led by volunteer groups. Also continuing to support the fight against pathogens that cause Kauri dieback and Myrtle rust.



#11248



1d. Is there anything else 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:

Need a balanced approach with less funding than planned so prioritising public transport and network optimisation are good priorities.

2a. Is there anything you 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 better utilised 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:

Support a more diversified fund approach that has a better return. Support creating a reserve as an alternative to insurance premiums that are only going to increase.



#11248



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 is the best of both worlds. Allows retaining of land ownership while benefiting from a commercial operation managing risk and costs associated with the operation.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Current model not sustainable.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self-insurance is a good option in a world where insurance through commercial companies is no longer a good option and premiums continue to increase.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 real estate that could be made available for other purposes.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#11248



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Reduce viability of operation if released. This would need to be considered as part of a wider plan for the port to move or scale back entirely.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#11248



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,Kaipātiki,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?



#11248



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

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



#11248



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Very Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Very Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	Very Important

Tell us why



#11248



7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	Fairly Important
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Fairly Important
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Fairly Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Very Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Very Important
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	Very Important



#11248



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?

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	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?

supporting local boards more so local lens on improvement could be made

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11256



council controlled organisations and the budgets they run, with poor management and plans, and are acting as political bodies versus deliverers of quality outcomes for the city. lets contractors getting overpaid.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

we need more cycle ways and opportunities to get out of cars

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cycle ways and infrastructure for young people to travel. a proper regional train or bus, or ferry system

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:

Formal Proposal for the Preservation and Revitalization of North Harbour Stadium

Summary:

This proposal advocates for the preservation of North Harbour Stadium while acknowledging the recent decline in its utilization. A thorough investigation, devoid of political influence, is recommended to identify the root causes behind this downturn. Subsequently, a competent management group, inclusive of community representatives, should be established to develop a comprehensive revitalization plan. This plan should encompass a cohesive approach to Auckland's sporting and entertainment infrastructure while taking into account the financial contributions of the North Shore community.

Preserving North Harbour Stadium: A Strategic Move



#11256



The demolition and reconstruction of North Harbour Stadium represent a significant financial outlay. This proposal posits that revitalization efforts focused on maximizing current infrastructure offer a more cost-effective solution. Preserving the stadium allows for continued community engagement and contributes to the cultural fabric of the region.

Investigating the Decline: A Path to Revitalization

The noticeable decline in North Harbour Stadium's utilization warrants a comprehensive investigation. This examination should objectively assess the impact of the management shift under council control on factors such as:

- Event frequency and variety
- Community engagement initiatives
- Maintenance practices

Additionally, the broader context of council-managed facilities should be explored. Does this decline reflect systemic issues within the council's management structure? Identifying the root causes behind the underutilization of North Harbour Stadium is crucial for formulating effective revitalization strategies.

Collaboration is Key: Building a Sustainable Future

The formation of a competent management group, inclusive of community representatives and industry experts, is paramount. This group will be tasked with:

Conducting a comprehensive investigation into the decline in usage.

Assessing all viable options for the future of the stadium.

Developing a data-driven, long-term plan for maximizing the stadium's potential.

Furthermore, a cohesive approach to the future of Auckland's sporting and entertainment infrastructure is necessary. This necessitates collaboration with stakeholders involved in other stadiums across the region.

Respecting the Stakeholders: A Community-Centric Approach

The financial contributions of the North Shore community towards the construction of the stadium merit due consideration. Their voices, along with those of the broader Auckland populace, should be incorporated into the decision-making process.

Conclusion: A Catalyst for Growth

By prioritizing revitalization over demolition, North Harbour Stadium can be transformed into a vibrant hub once again. Strategic planning, collaborative efforts, and the engagement of knowledgeable experts are key to achieving this objective. A



#11256



revitalized North Harbour Stadium will serve not only the North Shore community but also act as a valuable asset for the entire Auckland region.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#11256



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support



#11256



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Rodney, Upper Harbour



#11256



Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
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?



#11256



all factors contributing to the health and wellbeing of our communities are important

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 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



#11256



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Very Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Very Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Very Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Very Important



#11256



Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Fairly Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

very good, need more support to do

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.	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



#11256



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.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

very good, need more support for 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

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?



#11256



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

Tell us why

it has become a super diverse region so continual improvement is essential

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

great

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



#11256



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?

engage community for private partnerships. work in unison to support the stadium as well as this

8. Do you have any other comments?

Council Controlled Organisation Accountability needs to be priority, not only on the spend, also the decision making processes, limiting the politics, and the inappropriate behaviours of staff in senior positions trying to influence the way people consult.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do 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?

There is a need to import more construction companies from other countries to help to build the roads, as the local construction companies cant meet the demand.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11295



Pay less to support the maori people, government needs to be fair to every race. Also, reduce the cycleways, use the money to build more roads

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I agrees to reduce the spending on the cycleways. There are not so many people riding bikes. But more people use the cars, the current road system cant meet the demand now.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I am happy to spend more on building more roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Already mentioned above

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:



#11295



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

Not

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?



#11295



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	



#11295



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
---	----------------



#11295



Support 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.	

Tell us why

P

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Widen the motorways

8. Do you have any other comments?

Mot



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11319



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

not all raised ped crossings are equal!

I support in principle, but not the wholesale shotgun approach.

Similarly, limiting road speeds - many ill conceived and frustrating. TOO many different road speeds - needs to be more consistency. 30kph outside all schools etc but only at uniformly agreed hours.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Take all opportunities on offer to develop and better utilise the stadium.

AC must ensure the stadium is well maintained

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#11319



Tell us here:

Prepare a comprehensive feasibility plan toward moving the freight/container/vehicles components to other locations within next 20yrs.

A freestanding automated port in the Firth of Thames [near Orere point?] seems to give the most advantages... altho costly

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

in the meantime

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

see 4b

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#11319



Tell us why:

As long as footprint is NOT extended any further into the harbour.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#11319



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#11319



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

7c. What 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	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Help rural communities with undesirable road users, keep our road users safe so we can ride bikes, horses and walk safely on our roads. (With no footpaths)

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11327



Read tape and over spending on time and money wasting projects. Les's talk and more do!

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Rural communities need raised pedestrian crossings to make their communities safe. Coatesville has a school 2 daycares 2 cafes a pony club fruit sales mechanics and a dairy all in the town centre and people still speed through at 70-80kph. Sunnyside road has idiots on it at all hours and a recent traffic survey showed 49% of cars were speeding... it's not safe and it's used as a cut through, no locals treat it like a race track.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rural traffic safety. Returning Coatesville Riverhead road to 70-80kph and dropping the side roads to 60 where local users are.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Council money wasting.

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:

Recent management has been rubbish. It should be open for gigs, events and local shows. Why can't it be used for classic car show and shines etc. it's central to Albany and has been left to rot with sub standard service and facilities get people who care back in there and get it back to being part of the community not a sports only waste of space.



#11327



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Auckland deserves to have its Harbour back. Not imported cars in a carpark.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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:



#11327



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support



#11327



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,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?



#11327



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

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?



#11327



I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Fairly Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	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.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



#11327



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

Coatesville

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

I would like to see an over-investment in public transport - specifically electric buses, which I think are the only practical form of public transport that will work across all of Auckland in the medium term. It's ok to change routes but we should not be removing any.



#11351



Instead of charging for the park and ride, why not survey people to see where they're coming from and why they didn't take the bus? Have you done this? Are you sure they are full with people who could have taken the bus?

It's likely we'll lose money on buses in the first few years but I think having frequent, cheaper and well connected bus routes are essential before we'll see a meaningful shift away from cars.

On another note - I am one of many Aucklanders who is dealing with a new (10 year old) leaky apartment. I bought my apartment off the plan, and our building is looking at 50 million dollars worth of repairs. The council will end up footing some of the bill for this, as Auckland council signed off on this building when it was built.

How is this still happening? How was this allowed to happen? Building inspection services **MUST** improve or Aucklanders will continue to lose money and faith in the council.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Let's face it - most people are not going to cycle to work. Can we please focus on buses first, and cycle lanes second?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Most of the plan looks good. I don't like the idea for charging for the park and ride though, as per my earlier point, I'd prefer investing in more feeder buses and making them cheaper.

I also don't think we should remove bus routes, but possibly change them.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Capped weekly passes are great, but if most people are catching the bus during the week, parking in the city is \$15 and the bus costs \$10 per day - it's still too tempting to drive. Buses **HAVE** to be cheaper.

Also we need many more of them (see my earlier point).



#11351



2b. 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 big piece of land that could be put to better use - kill it

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

I completely support selling shares in the airport to diversify assets and hopefully get better returns on our investments. I think investments should make up a much larger proportion of how we fund council plans than rates.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#11351



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

It sounds like it needs to stay as is for now - whether 15 years is feasible I'm not sure.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#11351



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#11351



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I would like to hear how you're tackling the plague of leaky homes. I think you must be spending a good chunk of money settling lawsuits - it would be prudent to fix the problem at its source and actually inspect the buildings properly in the first 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?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As 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?



#11364



Less road development. There should be a major move to encouraging more people to use buses and trains

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less road development. There should be a major move to encouraging more people to use buses and trains

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Subsidising public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Road development including unnecessary road repairs

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:

Evidence suggests the current operational management has done little to encourage use of the stadium

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:



#11364



It is difficult to answer this without knowing

- a) what is the annual dividend from the shares and how much the share price has risen over several years
- b) what is the % contribution to the annual budget
- c) Why is this being considered

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

After so much talk and reports a positive decision should be made to move the port out of Auckland

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:

The wharves should be brought up to a reasonable standard but their use should be limited to developing parks not stadiums



#11364



5b. What option do you prefer 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?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know



#11364



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#11364



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Not Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity 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?

Yes. In this document there is no opportunity to comment on the 3 rate options for the next 3 years!



#11364



Why is this?

I would prefer to see a rate rise of less than 2%. With all the other demands on peoples household budgets how can the Council place itself in a position where it becomes respected less and less. After all rates are what the people pay.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?

Auckland needs a fit-for-purpose surf life saving club in Mairangi Bay. The current building does not meet the needs of the community.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11367



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We're in need of more pedestrian crossings so that people can safely get to work, school and access public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport, pedestrian crossings and cycleways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

More roads.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#11367



Tell us 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.

Support



#11367

Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#11367



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Fairly Important



#11367



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 less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11371



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)?

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:



#11371



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain 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 there was a decent plan for public benefit that would be interesting, however, the chances are that land would be used to build apartments etc. and public access would be restricted or non-existent, what is the benefit? Auckland - just look at Queen St

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#11371



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	I don't know



#11371



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#11371



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

Important issues for a fast developing area.

7c. What 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 more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Fewer unnecessary road changes such as raised crossings, speed tables and speed bumps. Fix the potholes, sort out congestion and make public transport efficient and attractive.



#11441



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:

Transport links and car parking at the stadium is abysmal. Fix it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#11441



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	I don't know



#11441



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#11441



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	I don't know
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	I don't know
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	



#11441



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?

Proposal to reintroduce a toll on the Harbour Bridge to pay for transport and roading costs, and a second crossing. Look at Baltimore: bridge goes down, economic ruin. A 50c electronic toll would reduce reliance on cars, raise a huge amount of money (~\$100,000/day), and would barely be noticed by drivers. Think about it.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	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?



#11465



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transportation is under-invested.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

1. As an absolute must, using the remainder of RFT as funding, action the Glenvar/East Coast Road intersection project - continuing advocacy and support via Auckland Transport and to Waka Kotahi until work is funded and completed. This must be in both the Pay More and Pay Less options!
2. Ensure that the Vaughans/Okura River Road upgrade/improvements are actions to open the road. The current situation does not meet expectations stated in legal documents whereby four road accesses to Long Bay are stated. The Vaughans Road closure means one of the four is not accessible.
3. Increase vehicle parking at major (express) transit hubs, such as bus stations on the NX routes - including multi-storey buildings if parking is at a premium or space doesn't allow non multi-storey buildings.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Immediately stop building expensive "custom" \$300,000 speed bumps/raised crossings. If traffic calming/safety raised crossings are deemed necessary use only the substantially cheaper and more efficient to install precast/premade options.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is an important regional asset and operational management should be improved, with more events and usage.



#11465



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 capital investment in AIA is not providing sufficient returns. A more flexible and targeted investment would likely provide better returns.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Better financial outcomes.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Better financial outcome - Auckland Future Fund an increasing source of income.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#11465



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:

Given the selected option to retain profits/dividends of POAL to Auckland Future Fund, any significant reduction in capability of the port would be detrimental to the growth of Auckland Future Fund.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	Support



#11465



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#11465



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
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



#11465



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The following should be high priorities:

1. Using the remainder of RFT as funding, action the Glenvar Road/East Coast Road intersection project - continuing advocacy and support via Auckland Transport and to Waka Kotahi until it work is funded and completed. This intersection is un-safe and congested.
2. The Vaughans Road/Okura River Road upgrade/improvements are actioned to open the road. The current situation does not meet expectations stated in legal documents whereby four road accesses to Long Bay are stated. The Vaughans Road closure means one of the four is not accessible.

Additionally the following would be excellent local board 10 year priorities:

- a community centre/bookable community space in Long Bay
- ensuring commitments for the Long Bay Precinct of the Auckland Unitary Plan are met in relation to planting and regeneration. For example, but not limited to, the Vaughans Stream and Wetlands Corridor, and Piripiri Point Protection areas.
- an all ages park/playground and connecting community spaces/structures adjacent to Long Bay Village

Also, the 2024/2025 projects/activities for "future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones" should be extended to include absorption and/or protection of land adjacent or near to parks/reserves, ensuring land designated as open space is retained, especially land around Long Bay Regional Park. As an example, transacting "Lot 601" from the Developer to Auckland Council ownership.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Sustainability initiatives on a user pays basis

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11503



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:



#11503



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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



#11503



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#11503



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	
--	--

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

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



#11503



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?

I think we need a permanent solution to the Orewa Beach erosion challenges (sand replenishment)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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	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 focus even further on addressing the massive infrastructure gap created by poor decision making by previous Councils!! It might not be pretty and Shiny for ribbon cutting, but it's what our future generations need.



#11513



Shiw mire leadership in creating a low carbon city and transforming us to a low carbon economy.

1d. Is there anything else 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 more to public transport not roads.

This should include cycling too though! Get people out of cars requires a safe way to do so.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycling infrastructure. Electrifying public transport.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Building bigger roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

I live close by. The stadium is completely wasted in its current form and operation so something has to change. The North Shore needs a decent sized stadium to both support the growth of local teams and attract big sports and other events. I don't want a downgrade to local parks.



#11513



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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 support this as it sounds like helping future generations, not borrowing from them or kicking the can down the road, which is the model of past councils and the current Government.

4d. Do you have 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:



#11513



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	I don't know



#11513



Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#11513



Support the development of community led resilience networks 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

7c. What 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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11525



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?



#11525



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#11525



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#11525



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity	Fairly Important



#11525



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	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?



#11544



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?

Cycle lanes, we are not a cycling nation.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11544



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#11544



Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 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



#11544



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective	Fairly Important



#11544



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 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?

Increased investment in protecting and restoring our natural environment and support for climate change initiatives that engage communities beyond infrastructure initiatives.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11568



Scale back on some event/activation - focus on large scale events or events that have low cost per attendee and those that stimulate the economy for Auckland.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not support reduction in cycleways.

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:

This is an underused asset so support looking at other options to make better use of the precinct with stadium buildings that need maintenance 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#11568



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Split across continuing to fund council services and invest in the AFF

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#11568



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#11568



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Support "Do More" for NETR not just "resume"

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?

Do not support reducing investment in environmental/sustainability programmes with schools. Youth are a legitimate part of our community that warrant support and investment and given the environmental/climate challenges we are facing it is short sighted to reduce programmes that enable their engagement and action for these 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?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11575



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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 very important to keep the stadium as it is because it is home to many people and an important part of the community. It promotes healthy lifestyles and it a place to showcase talent from the North Harbour 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)?

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:



#11575



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	



#11575



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11586



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The costs of public transport are astronomical. Increasing those is becoming insane and gives me a poor feeling in general about Auckland Transport. If you compare to other cities across the world and even in NZ, Auckland is one of the highest, yet it is the largest city in NZ. It makes no sense.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Transport costs. Having a weekly pass to reduce costs would help, but most of us are hybrid now so putting that into consideration would be good.

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:

How would it make sense to redevelop something that isn't used as intended in the first place? Improving the use of it is a good start, once it is being used as intended, that's when it would make sense to consider redevelopments to make it 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#11586



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

NZ investments aren't that great right 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:

I think this is future thinking and the investment would provide return over the long term.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#11586



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#11586



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#11586



Support 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

Outdoor areas are essential for our mental health as a society.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Makes sense.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

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.



#11597



- 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?

Less spending within Council, tighter control of internal spending, contracts, greater efficiency, etc. Audit, find and eliminate the fat and inefficiencies.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Get the RFT back.

2a. Is there anything you 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



#11597



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#11597



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to 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	



#11597



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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 (but in seriously deteriorating condition). 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



#11597



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



#11597



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	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?



#11607



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:

Need to ensure the budget is retained and utilised for the development of the stadium precinct. There is a need to review the operation of the stadium and ensure its fit for purpose for the future population of North Auckland. A stadium is required but something that is more flexible.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11607



Need to ensure the investment received is significant

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 should be used for both current services and investment

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer 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



#11607



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#11607



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Not Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	Not Important



#11607



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

It would have been helpful to identify what undeveloped reserves you are talking about. I don't agree with council spending budget and time to support community led resilience networks as a priority.

7c. What 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 do not support introduce Fairer Funding if it means that some local boards are going to see their funding dropped. Absolutely those boards that have less funding should see an increase but not to the detriment of others.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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 recycling facilities - we used to recycle glass into separate colours in the UK, which made me believe it was actually recycled. I cannot believe it is in NZ as it is all broken up together. Also get rid of the crazy low speed limits put in place OR put up speed cameras to catch the people blatantly doing the "old" speed limits, which is very intimidating to those of us who abide by the rules. KEEP THE NORTH HARBOUR



#11613



STADIUM AND ACTUALLY USE IT FOR EVENTS!!!! Keep the Gulf Harbour Golf Course, but potentially change it into a park and cafe for ALL to use, not only ponsy golfers

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Employ less pointless people at councils - including the Mayor! Stop granting permission for crazy concrete based infill. This is not helping with flooding or road congestion

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Seems to be the most favourable, with the most ticks

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Ferries from Gulf Harbour - electric if these are more environmentally friendly

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reducing speed limits to ridiculously low speeds that hardly anyone abides to

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is far too good an asset to demolish! Use it for more sporting and musical events PLEASE! How about the new Auckland Football Team? I would definitely go to (men's) football matches here, as well as concerts



#11613



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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?



#11613



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#11613



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.

Fairly Important

Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response



#11613



Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	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.	
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?

I chose the wrong local board (I live in Stanmore Bay) so will not make a specific comment here EXCEPT it was impossible to go "back" to change the board without needing to start the entire document again! Not particularly user friendly

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities



#11613



8. Do you have any other comments?

This was not very well advertised, nor very user friendly to complete. I guess that's the idea - so the council put through the suggestions they want rather than what the poeple 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?

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	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increase the natural environment targeted rate

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11623



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport. Improving safety and priority for cycling. Pedestrian safety

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund 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:



#11623



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support



#11623



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

