

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

Written Feedback
Hibiscus and Bays Volume #5



Sub #	Organisation Name	Page Number
17901	Murrays Bay Intermediate	146
17904	Craftsman Consulting Ltd	154
18042	Nana Li Real Estate	353
18187	For our health	646
18341	North Harbour Rugby Supporters Club and Marist North Harbour Rugby Club	930





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Proceed with the proposal
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you

prefer the profits and dividends to be used?





Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the prop	osal?
Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to port operations	be managed as part of the
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for some public benefit, within 15 years	thing else, that provides
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest 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







for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Other
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

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





## **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	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 the frequency of public events that have low attendance to save on costs., Cut back on expensive consultancy services and rely more on in-house expertise., Streamline council operations to reduce administrative costs without affecting service





quality., Decrease funding for public art projects that do not have broad community support to focus spending on widely beneficial services.

#### 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?

1. Make parking on one side of narrow roads only. Shouldn't be able to park on both sides if it results in only one lane of traffic space to be shared both ways. 2. Logical flow of traffic ie. Direct traffic down Ian Sage Rd rather than up the narrow section of Glenvar Rd. Not a big infrastructure adjustment, could possibly get away with a paint job... Maybe not. But the narrow Glenvar Rd section isn't suitable as a default traffic flow. Ian Sage Rd is far more suitable to cope with traffic flows, but the road doesn't lead that way without a conscious decision.

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

Planning studies that take a long time.

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

I don't know

#### Tell us why:

It would depend on what impact less land would have.

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





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?

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Tell us why:

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







Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	







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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

#### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for 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?

Organize more community workshops on sustainability to educate and engage residents, Enhance public transportation options, including more frequent services and new routes., Provide additional resources and support for local cultural events to enrich community life.





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

Cut back on expensive consultancy services and rely more on in-house expertise.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?  Support most of the proposal
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?  Better and more frequent public transport., Green, eco-friendly travel options
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  I don't know
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:





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

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This
increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.







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

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





## **Local board priorities**

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

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This is the home of football.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	n wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

## **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It makes sense
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

## Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Important to support local sport and the community
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	·
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

Submit	tter de	etails:
--------	---------	---------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It took many years and hugh effort and money raised by many people to get this stadium for North Shore . It need to be used for more events which was always the plan.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





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

Tell us here:

5a.	What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell	us why:	

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

Tell us why:

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

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







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We live in the community and it is situated in an ideal location on the North shore. No travelling over the bridge. Plenty of parking and support our local businesses.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by			







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
My 2 boys always play football over here.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium can be utilised and used so much better with management that promotes it much better than the recent past. The growing population of north Auckland demonstrates that a venue like this is necessary. The transport links via the busway are already there. People who had the vision and foresight in the 80's and 90's to build this asset did it for future generations. I'm a child of that time, so they did it for me. I have attended many events there, so it's now up to me to protect it for my children and future grandchildren who still live and work in the area.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 prop Tell us here:	osal?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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





8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
C		111	-1-1-	:1
<b>~</b> 111	nm	ITTOR	deta	HG.
Ju			uela	HJ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This is a great asset for our area!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
C		111	-1-1-	:1
<b>~</b> 111	nm	ITTOR	deta	HG.
Ju			uela	HJ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

Tell us why:

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

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

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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? Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 1	
	hm	1++~ r	$\sim$	1	$\sim$
JUL		itter	(16	2141	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: That is a good place to hold big play. 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).				
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by				

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: It seems a shame that a relatively new stadium be brought down when a change in management could probably turn it into a profitable entity. 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
To provide our community with an outstanding venue for sports fixtures and events. The North Shore and Rodney is growing rapidly and to lose the stadium is to lose a venue of significance for the future. We uses the bus way to get to events in the city and Mt Smart. The North Shorth businesses would profit greatly if we could get the crowds to come on the superb busway to events at North Shore. We have the restaurants and shops to show everyone a great time time. We are a growing population let's use this to keep us a growing local economy and community with a heart run under good leadership.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 proportion that the proportion is a second of the proportion of th	osal?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	-
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

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





8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Su	hm	itter	deta	ils:
<b>u</b>	~:::		acta	…

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





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

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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter	details:
-----------	----------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



#17602
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It used to attract to acts and events which made things way more accessible for those of us up north, the council Mgmt has let it slide, letting the local community down. It needs to be returned to its former success!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





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

TAI	l He	here:	

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

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

Tell us why:

Tell us why:

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

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







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	•	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because it's the only stadium we have on the North Shore and I'd like to see it used to it's full potential instead of wasting away
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter	details:
-----------	----------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



"11010
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This is a resource that will never be recovered if let go. We have seen the decline of New Zealand as a nation as one asset after the other is sold off because it went in the too hard basket and politicians saw a quick buck to make up for woeful money mangement. There are plenty of places to save money, and if you can't, maybe it should be your salary that helps to make up the deficit.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	

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

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detail	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	--------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: North shore needs a stadium for local people and even for the whole Auckland. We need to use it more efficiently instead of demolishing 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)? 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: From the people, for the people, by the people not the 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)? 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium is in a great location on the north shore which is currently under utilised, with the right events and promotion of the stadium more people will be able to enjoy 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
What would you let be built there? Mores houses? It is a great piece of architecture and structure and needs to be allowed to used for more local events schools, large local businesses iw real estate companies concerts sports 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)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





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

Tell us here:			
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This			

increases rates for the average value residential property by 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: Because we love the North Shore Stadium very much, I often take my children to run here, I also take my wife to play sports, it is very important, a lot of neighbors and friends around love the stadium, it is very beautiful, just fantastic! Make sure you keep it! Thank you very much 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have 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

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







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Stadium should be kept and operation management should be replaced to bring revenue to maintain the operation cost.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's a vital asset for sports, cultural and general activities. The travel to other stadiums is a nightmare. This stadium is the key feature within our 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:

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





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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?





#17033
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We sorely need to retain the only built for purpose ball sports stadium on the Shore. We are trying to encourage youngsters to be passionate about sport and to participate, so we need to retain a facility that can engender this. It can also be considered for other activities such as concerts and specialist days.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:				
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?				
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by				

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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?





#11300
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is the ONLY suitable stadium north of the bridge for sports finals in Rugby and Soccer both at senior and Junior level. It should have been used much more in the past but grounds management refused to let it be used. It must be used regularly and much more frequently than previously. Let's be less precious about the best stadium north of the bridge.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:			
	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
	Tell us why:		
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
	Tell us why:		
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
	Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in		

144

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

## **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Murrays Bay Intermediate

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  It's an asset to have for North Shore Events and Games
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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?





<i>11</i> 11 00 <b>2</b>
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium was a community project, it's in a perfect location and should be used for more than just sports. Has potential Auckland wide and further for concerts as well. Auckland is sadly lacking in venues resulting in losing out on a lot of revenue, take for example the recent broohah over Taylor Swift not coming to NZ. To lose this asset would be sacrilege.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have 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:	
Ton us why.	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)	
and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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	

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

average value business property.

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







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

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

## **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Craftsman Consulting Ltd

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's a community facility that was created by and for the citizens / residents / ratepayers of the North Shore and should remain as such. It's just been badly mismanaged.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a very important part of the community with the potential to make a significant contribution
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because North Shore has a massive growing population and we need to look to the future and maintain it
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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





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

<b>C</b> -	٠.١ـ		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It can be used for far more than it currently is so work on how to do that instead of depriving the community of a stable good building by adding housing and more traffic issues.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: Iconic landscape view and attraction. Part of who we are as 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)? 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  I want to go there for 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden Whatves?				
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).				
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by				







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

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





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium is a fantastic facility for the North Shore and it is such a shame that it is not utilised to its full potential. We need games, concerts and events. The Council should concentrate on its core functions and not be the manager. Give the management to a company that specialises in this area.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?			
Tell us here:			
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount			

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

#### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

#### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
With out the stadium we won't have a sports venue north of the harbour bridge for events and for our youth to engage in healthy team sports. This facility has so much potential to be utilized and be profitable if managed correctly.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

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







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: I love this place, the same as my family. We go the every week. 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		







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

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





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
A great family venue & facility. Have attended many event since it was established with great memories. Surrounding sports fields facilities are also regularly 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)?
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 Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you 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 needs better management and a wider usage other than just 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)? 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?

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





Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsus	en whatves :
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



#11923
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 local North Shore City residents formed a trust, raised the money, purchased the land, built the stadium then had the useless super city take control of our asset and run it into the ground through poor management and an agenda to move everything to South of the bridge. We, the rate payers of North Shore, deserve a lot better than the current rabble who manage Aucklands stadia. Save our stadium!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?
Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in
the protection of native ecosystems and species. This
increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business
property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and
extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that
we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

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

average value business property.

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







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

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

#### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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? Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

#### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
I have been to many events at the stadium over the years, yes it is a convenient location for me but it is also a great venue being so close to all the motorways especially now with the Western Ring route. I have had to transport my children to many venues over the years and they are usually well off the main roading network. With North Harbour Stadium it is directly off the motorway network, an ideal location with the added advantage of having accommodation, eateries and the bus network within walking distance. I feel the stadium is under utilised currently and more could be done to promote the facility and location.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 nere:		
	4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:		
	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
	Tell us why:		
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:			
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value		

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







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

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





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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?





#17930
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is important the NorthShore retains the stadium. A venue like this is vital for sporting and other events. It is being under utilized due to poor management. We do not need more apartments. There is not the basic infrastructure at this stage.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





 $\pi$ 1730

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

Tell us here:		
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Great lille stadium. Just not managed well. Bring back some Blues games, maybe NRL, cricket, whatever.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsus	en whatves :
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Growing up in Albany, I've had the opportunity to attend various events at the stadium over the years. I would love to see the stadium bring in more events as it has been lacking in recent years and the community is suffering as a result.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

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







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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	

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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Keep the land asset for future generations as intended by the local community.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	·
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the  Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  It has good value to people in 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  It's an iconic symbol odour 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:

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





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

_				
C		111	-1-1-	:1
<b>~</b> 111	nm	ITTOR	deta	HG.
Ju			uela	HJ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is the only major stadium on the North Shore. With better promotion and management the stadium would become more productive
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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?





$\pi$ 1131
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 a vital, integral part of the North Shore infrastructure. Under the Councils management since 2014, it has been allowed to be run down and poorly marketed (if at all). The Stadium management should be handed back to a separate board and to the Community who care. Our children are our future, and they deserve fit for purpose Stadia. Ahman
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:
	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
,	Tell us why:
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
,	Tell us why:
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

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

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North Shore needs a viable stadium to hold major sporting events. Being within walking distance of a major transportation hub makes North Harbour stadium a plainly obvious solution.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by 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

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

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

average value business property.







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5	ia. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Т	ell us why:
5	b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Т	ell us why:
6	a. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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







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

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

# **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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?





# 1 <i>1</i> 30
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
There are no other stadiums for residents of the North Shore. It is used for a wide range of activities for children and adults. It needs upgrading to attract more sporting and arts 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)?
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?





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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

# **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
To be able to have significant sporting (and other) events on the North Shore/close to Hibiscus Coast rather than having to travel to Eden Park or Mount Smart.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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?





#17993
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is ridiculous that this is even being considered. Albany is a huge growing area and a central point for the North Shore. With proper management this stadium could be well run and a huge positive. Keep the stadium, change management and do better to invest in 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)?
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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?
Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter	details:
-----------	----------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: Please keep the stadium. Thanks. 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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





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

Q.,	hm	itter	dota	ile:
ou	DIII	IILLEI	utla	IIIƏ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The North Shore is a very fast growing area, with many young families. We need to encourage our young people to be involved in sports and the ability to watch first class games of league, rugby, football etc here on the Shore is important. If the stadium goes, there is no other facility like it on the North Shore. It could also be used for concerts. It is said transport is an issue, but that could easily be solved by re-routing buses to the stadium on event days/nights. It is only minutes away from the motorway for people to go north, south or west.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 prop Tell us here:	osal?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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





8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

Tell us why:

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

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

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







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
A vile waste of a facility that can be used by communities for different 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is vital for the future of North Harbour and the wider area. Since the Auckland Council took over the management in 2014, the venue has been poorly managed and allowed to decay with little \$\$\$\$ spent and or to market and promote this vital piece of infrastructure,
KEEP the Stadium and hand back the management to people who had a proven record of success. !!!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?
Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

$\sim$ 1	- 4 4		• •
Suhr	nittar	MATS	nile:
JUDI	nitter	utio	เมอ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
we need a place for community 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

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

Transport	
Water	
0:4	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Livironnient 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?





#10010
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Because over the past 40 years I have supported North Harbour sports teams and then the stadium being built by purchasing seats in the stand and attending worthwhile events. The last 10 years has seen an absolute decline in quality events/ functions etc.Needs a new independent board running it with support of good performing teams the North Shore has.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?
Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).





3	2.
	<u></u>

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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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?





π 100 i
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We are a city in ourselves! The north shore has been ignored for too long since the super city inception. We deserve top class facilities for our children, families and communities. It brings people together!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have 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	l us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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





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

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

### **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because new independent management should promote events.
This is not a Council function
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

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





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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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?





# IOULL
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 what make Albany and North Shore Special from eastern southern anf western auckland. The only place where sports shines. It would be a desaster to demolish it. Its easy to demolish and it will never be back if the community want it again in the future and the cost would be too high to build. Please stop using a short term vision and look at the futuref
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the prop	osal?
Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en 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	
we can continue to rund the water quality improvements in	

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

average value business property.

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

			_
$c \cdot \cdot \cdot k$	mitter	4616	16.
2111	MINITE	nerai	16.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: A valued asset, appreciated and used by thousands in the community 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We funded it, if you take it away from us this is downright theft from the people of the North Shore. Please manage it properly so we can enjoy our stadium
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is and has been a well functioning place for events. It has good parking, not in a developed residential area and has good bus access. It should have another stand built to cater for more and then can have more and bigger events booked there. It has been badly managed since 2014.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

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

average value business property.

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







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

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





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

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Nana Li Real Estate

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Such great place for 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
ren us wny.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_		- 4 4		
Su	bm	itter	deta	IIIS:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We've been using this stadium as our leisure activities for years, such an incredible place for community association. Of course we want to have it for 200% sure!!!!!!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The Stadium has hosted local and international competitions and the Shore deserves to have a stadium that we do not have to drive miles to get to.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Te	II us why:	
5b	o. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Te	II us why:	
6a	. What do you think of these proposals?	
tl ir a	Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by round \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business roperty.	
e p h fo	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in arbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value esidential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the verage value business property.	
C	Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to educe the need to consult each year for minor changes to	

the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We just need 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)?
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 Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's the only one we have
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium was held FIFA U20 World Cup. It is a nice place for holding soccer games 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)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  This is our stadium. We take care of it and we want our kids to run and play on the 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)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	

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

### Local board priorities

scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

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

around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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?





to

#10073
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
To cater for the population growth in the Northern suburbs and provide the very necessary and accessible venue for major events that avoids causing cross town an cross harbour bottlenecks for access and provide the community asset that it was designed for. The current failed operational management team should obviously be replaced having totally failed in their mission however there is absolutely no reason to throw the baby out with the bath water.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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





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

Submit	ter de	etails:
--------	--------	---------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?

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







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

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

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Utilise and improve on what we have. Money is tight. North Shore is part of Auckland with great potential and opportunities for the community. We were forced to join Auckland, so being some of Auckland over the bridge, instead of always on the other side of the City.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:





Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







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

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





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We need the stadium, but the current management is not good, we need to change the management to revitalize our stadium.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by			







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Su	hm	itter	deta	ils:
<b>U</b> u	viii	11101	ucu	411J.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  I love sports!!! I live in Northshore, We need to save the 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Once gone, never replaced. Needs new marketing/parking arrangements. Attract major sports team like new soccer team
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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





businesses and raises the share paid 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

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?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	1++~ r	$\sim$	1	$\sim$
JUL		itter	(16	2141	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It must be some better way. It is ridiculous to just remove it. Simple.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

## **Local board priorities**

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Change the management of the stadium, which can have more functions or open to small groups for kids
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.





# #18117

3	2.
	0
$\Rightarrow$	$\sim$

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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North shore should have a stadium, but need a better management
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





#### #18120



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Building the stadium decade ago was built on long term view while decision to scrap it is sheer short-sighted. There is no point for the council to build a new waterfront stadium while does not even commit to reinvigorate the existing 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)?
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 wh	arves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the  Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	

the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

CATTR would still require consultation).





### #18122



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

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

#### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





### #18125



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).





### #18126



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



<i>"</i> . • . • . • . • . • . • . • . • . • .
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The northern suburbs are growing constantly and keeping the stadium going in Albany is really important for our communities. There is hardly any events held at the stadium and that needs to change so that it can increase revenue and become the great event centre in the north that it needs to be. It would be shortsighted to shut down the stadium and a huge loss to north Auckland.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden	wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	

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

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

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

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).





### #18127

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

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

#### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





## #18128



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





## #18129



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North shore is a big area to have 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





# #18131



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





## #18132



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North Shore population is growing fastwe need an open space stadium to hold.more performances, games etc
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	-
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

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





## #18134



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We love the stadium, enjoy playing soccer there, great mix to the 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





# #18135



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We need 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by





## #18137



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Leave the building where is 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)?
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 why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).		
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		

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







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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).





## #18143



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





## #18146



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





## #18148



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





## #18149



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:	
	hat option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?  why:  nat do you think of these proposals?  me the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)  xtend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in otection of native ecosystems and species. This asses rates for the average value residential property by d \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business rty.  me the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and d it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual amme operating and interest costs. This ensures that in continue to fund the water quality improvements in urs and streams across the region, at a lower amount xt year than previously planned. This reduces this rate what was previously planned for the average value ential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the ge value business property.  len the description of bus services funded by the ate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to ge the need to consult each year for minor changes to us programme (any changes to the settings of the	
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





# #18151



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium is like a landmark for us on the North Shore, its presence is meant to make our Auckland shine even brighter.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

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





## #18153



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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
Т	ell us why:		
5	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Т	ell us why:		
6	a. What do you think of these proposals?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

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

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

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





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

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Keep this facility on the shore - just manage it better
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?





	•9	2	
			>
:	念	촞	

businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
For the health of people and future generations.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
it should be kept as ut 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

0-	٠.١.		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North Shore people are really want a really stadium by themselves. And it will improve the economy and increase the jobs.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Support 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:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





<b>T.</b>	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North Shore residents need it to perfect our lives
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The north shore should keep its own stadium with multifunctions to hold different events, which is beneficial to local residents and local economy.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Auckland Council, you cannot demolish the Stadium at our cost & sell it to benefit some developer, just to cover your incompetent 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)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a waste if the stadium cannot be used properly due to poor management
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

0-	٠.١.		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Our northshore only
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Termi	inal?	
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate</b> (I and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invite protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential proparound \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value but property.	vest in is perty by	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the an programme operating and interest costs. This ensure we can continue to fund the water quality improvement harbours and streams across the region, at a lower a for next year than previously planned. This reduces the from what was previously planned for the average varies idential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for average value business property.	es that ents in amount this rate	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) reduce the need to consult each year for minor chan the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	to ges to	

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:		
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?		
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?		
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?		
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management		
Tell us why:		
It's a beautiful venue that has hosted too and international football, including the u20s World Cup . It is also a great place for local clubs to have there matches . Keep our green spaces green . Also the amount of houses being built will mean there will be even more demand for this stadium 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)?		
Tell us why:		
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?		
Tell us here:		
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?		
Tell us here:		





	4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:
;	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
	Tell us why:
,	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
	Tell us why:
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): For our health

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?  Tell us why:  6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





# #18187



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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
I like our stadium
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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			





## #18189



businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium cannot be demolished! Tear down the community where the sports fans and kids are going to compete! This stadium can definitely host more events and activities!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:
Sh. What aution do you weeker for Diadialas Torreinal?
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	





# #18191



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

# **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





# #18193



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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
	Tell us why:		
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
	Tell us why:		
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.





# #18194



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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
C		111	-1-1-	:1
<b>~</b> 111	nm	ITTOR	deta	HG.
Ju			uela	HJ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	•
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).





# #18200



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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium is a staple of the north shore and sport north of the harbour bridge. Removing it would destroy a lot of sporting organisations and leave the north shore with no major outdoor venue. It was always a busy stadium until the council took control and it has been left to rot. Give it back to the North Shore so we can restore it to its former self.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
ren us wny.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is the only Stadium on the North Shore & was paid by the people of North Shore to build
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:					
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?					
Tell us why:					
6a. What do you think of these proposals?					
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.					
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.					
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).					
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by					

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Over the years I have attended many events at north harbour stadium and have appreciated the closeness and ease of access.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:  6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: It's been poorly managed a could be utilised way better 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?





3	<b>%</b>
$\rightarrow$	_

businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





#10212
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
<ul> <li>it has so much potential if just managed correctly it has been run by clipboard managers at the council vs experienced event organisers - when events and concerts take place it attracts and boosts the surrounding business with an expanding city Auckland cannnot reply on Eden park and the other half cooked stadium in the middle of nowhere ( Mt smart)</li> </ul>
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

average value business property.

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
With different management I believe the Stadium will once again host sporting and other events for the benefit of the community far and wide.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
	Tell us why:	
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
	Tell us why:	
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: Host international cricket tournaments 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the  Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
ren us wny.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
	Tell us why:	
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
	Tell us why:	
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
To provide the people of the north shore with a sporting entertainment centre (that we funded in 1997), North of the harbour Bridge and not reliant on akl transport to get to the other venue options.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?

6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us here:

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

# **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
ren us wny.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
	Tell us why:			
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
	Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

oa. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It would be such a waste - in so many ways - to get rid of this. Think of the future of our children having no station on the north shore. We love 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

<b>C</b> -	٠.١ـ		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  It's an assert that council have ruined since being run under the super city. Bring back events like sports, music concerts and 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Once its gone it will be forever. We need this stafium to help kids get into 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by			







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's an asset for the North Shore. Why should we always have to cross the bridge to attend events. We pay our rates too so should also have well run facilities.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





#10243
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is the only stadium for "North Shore City". It is under utilised but with better management could be used for sports, concerts etc. They have rooms for catering also. The new A League club would have been ideal club to be based there and have as a Home Ground. Buses can come from town and drop spectators off using the busway.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Its a great local stadium that has become underused over the last few years. It would be great to get it fully functional again for converts, sports and other events.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is important to have a local stadium that will provide sports entertainment etc facilities use of lounge for conferences as it was for 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Events! we have no other event space to host larger concerts, sports events etc on the North Shore.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:

Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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				

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:				
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?				
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?				
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?				
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management				
Tell us why:				
It is an easily accessible stadium that could be used for far more sports events, training, concerts, functions and conferences, if only you (Auckland Council) hadn't acted like a bunch of spoilt brats, and couldn't handle local residents actually operating something properly. Instead you took over and ran it into the ground like bullies in the playground. You intentionally made it too expensive for anybody to hire for an event. You intentionally made it old fashioned so nobody would want to use it. Do not destroy both the stadium and the ground around it, and sell if for housing because the area cannot cope with the increase in housing that is going on around 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)?				
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?			
٠	Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
(	6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
	Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to







reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
What else is on the Shore?
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:

Tell us why:					
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?					
Tell us why:					
6a. What do you think of these proposals?					
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.					
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.					
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).					
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by					

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>O</b>		144		•
<b>⋖</b> 11	nm	ITTOR	deta	ne.
S) LI	L <i>J</i> I I I		ucia	11.5

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



<i>"</i> 1020
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Simply this is an excellent facility that has been under-utilised for a long time. There needs to be better promotion of the facility and greater flexibility in pricing for events. The population growth North is huge and demand will only increase. We need better managers to exploit this area and start to gain usage of the stadium outside of just 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)?
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?





	4d. Do you have 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:
į	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
٠	Tell us why:
(	6a. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



# IOES
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 facility was built on the back of volunteers. They purchased the land, raised the money and formed the trust. Since the council took control in 2014 its gone backwards. Keep the stadium precinct and change the management. Simple.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

ţ	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
•	Tell us why:
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
•	Tell us why:
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

average value business property.

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Worked hard to get it and we need to have events there at an affordable cost!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because it's all the North Shore has for hosting larger events. The North Shore is similar in size and population to Christchurch and overwhelmingly supports all teams that play at NH Stadium when they come. E.g. Warriors, Blues, All Blacks, etc. The stadium is an awesome asset that just needs to be utilised better. Additionally, if it is demolished or repurposed and then in the future it's deemed that North Shore need another stadium it'll cost a truck load more to construct a new one than it's costing now to maintain. Do a better job managing the stadium instead of taking the easy road and flipping 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)?
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 properties.	osal?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The population at the top of the North Shore is growing rapidly. This is the only stadium on this side of the bridge. I feel that the council is treating the Shore like a backwater. I remember when the stadium was built there was a lot going on there, big sporting events, the Opera Carmen. The Council taking over has resulted in the stadium hardly being used (relative to when the Trust were in charge) and falling into disrepair. When the Super City was announced, I thought it would be great for all of Auckland. The stadium is just one issue that has made me wish we were back to Noth Shore City, which at least had our community as a priority.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you

prefer the profits and dividends to be used?





Tell us here:					
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal? Tell us here:					
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?					
Tell us why:					
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?					
Tell us why:					
6a. What do you think of these proposals?					
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.					
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.					

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to







reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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? Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a unique facility on the shore which has been significantly under utilised. If run properly this could be a real hub on the shore.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





# 10202
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Strongly object to auckland council selling an asset built and paid for by the people of the north shore because of their poor management and maintenance program since taking over the asset. If they ignore us and sell the asset the people of the north shore should decide where the money is spent.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Have better management and make it available to more users
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We need this type of facility on the north shore. It has been horribly mismanaged. New management please.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden Wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell	us	why:	
	40	,	

- 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
- 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
- 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

#### Tell us why:

The North Harbour Stadium is a North Shore community facility built by the blood, sweat & tears of local residents for the use and enjoyment of future generations. Auckland Council have deliberately mismanaged the North Harbour Stadium since acquiring it and have demonstrated gross negligence in their ability to manage any North Shore based community assets for the good of the local community. The North Harbour Club was the brainchild of founder's Ross Finlayson (then Funding Campaign Manager of the Stadium) and then ASB North Harbour Regional Manager, John Bishop. Who saw a vision to build a club around 'excellence' with new businesses popping up in the region because of the Stadium build. The North Harbour Stadium should be retained with new operational management to ensure it can continue to provide the benefits to the local community it was originally designed and built for.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell	IIS	why	,.
1011	uJ	** * * * * * *	

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?

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proportiel us here:	sal?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	n wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?





### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: This community needs it familys watch sports together youth go there more things for family's an youth will keep them out of trouble 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





<ul> <li>2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?</li> <li>2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?</li> <li>3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management</li> <li>Tell us why:  My children's sports teams use it</li> <li>4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?</li> <li>Tell us why:</li> <li>4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?</li> <li>Tell us here:</li> <li>4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?</li> <li>Tell us here:</li> </ul>	Tell us why:		
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:  My children's sports teams 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)?  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?	2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?		
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management  Tell us why:  My children's sports teams 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)?  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?	2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?		
Tell us why:  My children's sports teams 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)?  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?	3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?		
My children's sports teams 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)?  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?	Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management		
<ul> <li>4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?</li> <li>Tell us why:</li> <li>4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?</li> <li>Tell us here:</li> <li>4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?</li> </ul>	Tell us why:		
and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?	My children's sports teams use it		
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:  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 why:		
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?	4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?		
prefer the profits and dividends to be used?	Tell us here:		
Tell us here:			
	Tell us here:		

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fundand transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:  We need a stadium on the North shore for so many things, it's there and working well,
cut back on something else ? How about the high salary earners for a start!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden Wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).			
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by			







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Lots of good memories of events at the stadium. Very disappointing that the council wants to demolish it and no doubt sell off the land to the highest bidder
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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				

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The hibiscus coast is growing rapidly. Keep the studium for us to enjoy local events Auckland FC should be based 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)?
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 why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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				

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

<b>C</b> -	٠.١ـ		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: We want their to be football games up this way. It should be the home of the new Auckland Football team 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

ba. what do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a close local sporting venue for our 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

<b>C</b> -	- 1-		:44	٠.	. 4 _	: 1	_	_
ЭI	JU	m	itter	Œ	शव	ш	S	_

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  North Harbour rugby play games there. Many other functions take place there and also exhibitions. Also I believe it is an excessive expense which the council can not afford.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsus	en whatves :
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The North Shore needs an Event Centre Stadium for Sport concerts and other uses we paid for it in our rates so 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you preier for Captain Cook and Marsus	en whatves :
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

$\sim$ 1	- 4 4		• •
Suhr	nittar	MATS	nile:
JUDI	nitter	utio	เมอ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
I helped build it, it's a better stadium than Eden Park to watch games at, getting to and from it is easy. It has a good amount of history that has been created at it and it's part of the North Shore.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

average value business property.

programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a important community asset, and we need to keep 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden What ves?				
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).				
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by				







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





#10331
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It was poorly managed under the Supercity administration compared to the previous administration. It is an essential facility for all people North of the Harbour Bridge and also for all of Auckland residents. Under proper management and maintenance it could attract world class events and be both a sporting and cultural facility that whole of Auckland would benefit from
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

# **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:



# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?Tell us why:5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

^		itter		• •
•	nm	ITTAL	AAta	
JII.				

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Worked really hard to get it and North Shore needs 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter	details:
-----------	----------

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium is a long term asset for North Harbour and is in need of new management. It has certainly gone backwards under the current mob!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

#### Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): North Harbour Rugby Supporters Club and Marist North Harbour Rugby Club

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The Stadium if Functioning Correctly Could be Filled Constantly with great pricing and the access is Great/was great till they took some of the car park. Other Sport organisations tried to get a foot in but treatment not great. Outer oval was to be developed as an English Common for Cricket. Women rugby on 24th May Stadium should be encouraged to be Full
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:	USAI!
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	







the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

oa. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

#### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
North harbour population getting bigger. Will cost more to build another one
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



# 103 <del>4</del> 0
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 stadium is a fantastic location for sporting and entertainment events, easy access to public transport and would be a real boost to surrounding businesses. Poor management and poor decision making has driven this business into the ground. Handed over to the right management team this stadium could be bought back and be a real highlight on the North Shore.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:	osai <i>?</i>
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	

harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

#### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





πιοστο
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 used to be vibrant and to host regular events of all sorts right after the 2011 world cup. As a photographer, I even worked there on a regular basis, attending world class official competitions. The management team lea by Craig goodall was really passionate about the place.it seems completely wrong to even mention destroying the stadium while other stadiums in Auckland or booked to capacity already. Stop poor management of the city, use money for the people instead of the fancy lifestyle of 'leaders'.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual

programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's a core part of the Harbour culture!
it's a core part of the Harbour culture:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	-
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

#### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It would be a real shame to lose the only stadium we have on the shore. I've been to a couple of football games there and they were so easy to get to and made it more achievable to attend with being local. The cost to build a new one would hinder any replacement 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)?
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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?
Tell us here:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

<b>C</b> -	٠.١ـ		:44	٠.	-4-	: 1		
ЭI	JO	ш	itter		46	ш	S	:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management.
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





## 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves? Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

#### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? Tell us why: 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland? Tell us here: 4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used? Tell us here: 4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





For What aution do you profession Contain Cook and Maradan whomas			
	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
,	Tell us why:		
	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
,	Tell us why:		
	6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

#### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detail	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	--------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: NH Stadium is the best location for major sports in Auckland and the only one on the North Shore 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)? 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:

. ,				
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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				

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



$\pi$ 1037 (
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's an amazing asset for the region but isn't well managed. Having good operational management will help the stadium get back on track and bring events back to the shore! Why can't the stadium host rock concerts or international sporting events? What about having a purpose built cricket stadium on the site rather than an odd shaped Eden park! There is so much untapped potential in a fast growing 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)?
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:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why: 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on? 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on? 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium? Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management Tell us why: 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:			

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

ba. what do you think of these proposals?	·
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	







We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The area is growing and the need to it will only increase
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
To provide a sports facility for our children to experience sports games either as players or spectators. A wonderful sports facility on a growing north shore which needs to be utilized more than it is. More international sports games, music concerts etc please
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

^		itter		• •
•	nm	ITTAL	AAta	
JII.				

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





#18380
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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 asset was built & paid by Northshore and Rodney district council, before being forced by government to amalgamate with Auckland council. This is another example of flogging off ( selling assets ) of Northshore and Rodney Council Rate Payer Assets. I Reject ( against ) Selling this asset completely. I am asking my local Hibiscus and Albany ward councillors reps to Reject selling off this north shore asset to the community.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you

prefer the profits and dividends to be used?





Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?	
Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium was fundraised and built by volunteers. We want this stadium to remai and used for games and 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)?
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:

vinat option do you profer for ouptain oook and marsak	iii Wilai Voo :
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?



Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
My father was the chair of the stadium board who developed this incredible facility, a group who dared to think ahead for the growing needs of the North Shore community. People with foresight and dreams for a community hub to enrich our region and a base for sports teams, events and more. The North Shore and region north of Auckland continues to grow, we need facilities like this to create a liveable city. We need strong, dynamic local management with the interests of community at heart. To destroy this facility would be a travesty and a huge loss for the North Shore and wider Northern 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)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you

prefer the profits and dividends to be used?





Tell us here:				
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:				
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?				
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because it is an awesome underutilised community facility. The stadium if upgraded could be one of the best stadiums in Auckland to host events and concerts.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.				
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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				

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





# 1039C
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Live events will keep growing and growing in the future in response of so much fake information on the internet (AI will accelerate this). It'll be more important than ever to keep this facility in a growing community like North Shore but under a more effective 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)?
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?





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:					
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	n wharves?				
Tell us why:					
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:					
6a. What do you think of these proposals?					
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.					
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount					

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

average value business property.

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We need a decent stadium north Auckland. Right on the bus route, plenty of eating and drinking places within walking distance and no nearby neighbour's to annoy! Don't take this stadium away from us!
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a.	What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell	us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Not just for sports groups - business and music groups use the lounges for events as well. Such a shame it has got to this stage with poor promotion and 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wnarves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The population is growing North.and NorthWest. This is the closest stadium for all of them. Reinvent it, not scrap 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)?
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 why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Perfect for future of our children on the North Shore
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?	
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Maybe more events should be run there rather than just demolish it. It is centrally located within walking distance to the bus 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)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium can potentially be a huge magnet of revenue for the North Shore and a Centre of sport and cultural activities IF managed properly. It should not be managed by council.
I have an inkling why council would want to get rid of it. Demolition and sale to deep pocketed developers will get rid of current financial deficits, and provide long-term income through rates. A short sighted approach that neglects the interests of the local community. Surely there is a middle ground.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 proportion us here:	osal?			
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?			
Tell us why:				
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?				
Tell us why:				
6a. What do you think of these proposals?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value				

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to

average value business property.







reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?





8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

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?





$\pi$ 10-7 10
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Dear Auckland Council, Please keep the North Harbour Stadium, it has been sad to see those who are in charge of it make calls that have led to it be almost empty all year around. Please would you keep this as it is the only stadium on the North Shore, also it is quite easy for fans to get too with ample public transport. Positive flow on effects from keeping the stadium, - young fans/rugby players seeing their team on the field will inspire them - I've noticed that Moana Pacifica has been training at this stadium, would be great if they could have this to play all their home games retail, business nearby will see an increase in activity when there is events on. Please would you keep this stadium, I remember going to an All Blacks game here and it was a full house
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:



Tell us here:



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?  Tell us here:			
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?





### **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It was built by locals and the land purchased via a Trust. This valuable local resource belongs to the people of the North Shore and the council has no right to sell it or decommission 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)?
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?
Tel	I us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This is a community hub and has showcased great sports games and events in its time and brings revenue into North Harbour as a whole whilst offering entertainment for locals and others. The council's mismanagement is a disgrace to say the least! I could go on
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
An asset for local, national and international 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)?
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 Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
_		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:		
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?		
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?		
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?		
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management		
Tell us why:		
North shore is a growing area and we need to have facilities to host 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)?		
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The north shore is one of the fastest growing areas in Auckland with a hostoricly low level of council investment compared to rates take. This stadium can a will make a profit once the council stop mismanaging 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)?
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:

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)

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

			_
$c \cdot \cdot \cdot k$	mitter	4616	16.
2111	MINITE	nerai	16.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's fantastic having a stadium facility on the shore that I can take my kids to for sport and events. We wouldn't do this if we had to go into the city.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





;	5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
	Tell us why:
,	5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
	Tell us why:
	Sa. What do you think of these proposals?
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.
	Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Keeping the stadium and changing the management could lead to better use of the facilities such as music concerts which will bring revenue and employment into 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)?
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:

Tell us why:

#### 6a. What do you think of these proposals?

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	1++~ r	$\sim$	1	$\sim$
JUL		itter	(16	2141	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This was built for the Northshore and we should be using it, maintaining it and making it profitable.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell are subsu
Tell us why:
We need this facility on the shore. It should be better utilised.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:
4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





# 5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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

Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by

CATTR would still require consultation).







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
I have been a regular visitor to the stadium when it still had events. I would still far prefer to use this facility than track to the abysmal Mt Smart, and poorly located Eden Park. Removing this facility will be the final nail in the coffin of the Super City destroying the great things the North Shore created. Just poor.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us here:	osai?
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsd	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Because it's our stadium and the way the shore is expanding it makes no sense at all to change it. Eden park is to far away and if the other stand had been developed as originally planned this would be the facility in own
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?				
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.				
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate				

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

average value business property.







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_	_			
C	<b>L</b>	itter	4-1-	:1
<b>&gt;</b> 11	nm	ITTOR	ПФТЗ	me.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Save the community Assets.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 Whatves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Why not It needs to be used
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### **Local board priorities**

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	1++~ r	$\sim$	1	$\sim$
JUL		itter	(16	2141	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We need a specific sporting stadium on the north shore, run by the correct people we can have it thriving again with regular sporting events. if done well would also be the perfect spot for the new Auckland a-league franchise with dedicated football training facilities already in place.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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 prop	osal?
Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
We want a quality Stadium on the Shore that is a multi purpose event 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)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us here:



# 10 <del>1</del> 31
Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you 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:
Change the operational management of North Harbour Stadium to ensure greater use by the community. This is our families preference. The North Shore needs this stadium to function better. Not to be pulled down, or mismanaged again. Communities need a place to enjoy sports, functions, and larger events. Without it we would be going backwards.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsde	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It is a valuable asset to The people of the North Shore and wider Auckland community It needs better management to attract events for the 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:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?





Tell us here:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's a great asset for sports and should host concertsand my children.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium has such an amazing infrastructure! Let's make a better use out of it so to keep the stadium up and running. Millions of dollars goes down to support very minor, nonsense things as I've been watching around. So invest and maintain this great venue. Thanks
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us here:	
5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?	
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	

from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?		
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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

businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?  Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?	
	Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
The stadium should be a thriving community hub on the north shore, hosting plenty of events. Mismanagement needs to stop 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)?
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:

Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It was built by locals with local money and was managed very well u der Trust Management and has been abysmal under Council management and been left to rot on purpose. Fastest growing part of Auckland and need to keep it to support events for the Rodney and. North Shore ratepayers
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	

for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the

average value business property.

CATTR would still require consultation).







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Great location with public transport. No neighbours moaning about the noise. Great for local sports fans to be able to attend without going on a day trip. Shops, restaurants are nearby. It was built 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)?
Tell us why:
4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?
Tell us here:
4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?
Tell us here:





4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?
Tell us why:
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?
Tell us why:
6a. What do you think of these proposals?
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by 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

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the

average value business property.







Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This is the only stadium north of the Bridge.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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?





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsdo	en wharves?
Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	,
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Q.,	hm	itter	dota	ile:
ou	DIII	IILLEI	utla	IIIƏ.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium use to hum, it can again, we have limited facilities like this on the shore, it is near transport and could be used for many things as it once was.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	1++~ r	$\sim$	1	$\sim$
JUL		itter	(16	2141	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Miss management from removal of stands to no funding or 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)?
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:





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	1
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

				4 .	
	hm	ITTAL	$\sim$	+01	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10	1	•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Our community needs a venue of this size for sporting and community events. It's a huge asset to our community and we can't afford to lose 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)?
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:





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

	hm	ITTO	~~	-	$\sim$
.711		itter	(10)	111	•
vч	MIII		$\mathbf{a}$		•

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
Leave control of things you don't understand to those that do.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:	Sub	mitter	detai	ls:
--------------------	-----	--------	-------	-----

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:  Absolute no brainer to keep this asset in the community. Seems a new management
team is needed.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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:





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?		
Tell us why:		
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?		
Tell us why:		
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	-	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.		
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.		
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).		
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by		







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
<b>^</b>		144		
•	nm	ITTAL	COTS	nic.
OIL		itter	ueic	111.55.

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
It's North Shores only facility and is something that can be added on to in the future. It is an asset if run properly.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:





Tell us why:	
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?	
Tell us why:	
6a. What do you think of these proposals?	
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?







businesses and raises the share paid 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 <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## **Local board priorities**

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

_				
$\sim$		• 4 4	- 1 - 1 -	• • •
~ 11	nm	ITTAL	AAT2	ue.
OH	.,,,,	itter	uela	

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

#### Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

- 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?
- 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?
- 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Tell us why:
2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?
2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?
3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?
Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management
Tell us why:
This stadium has been a vibrant centre in the past for many events. Managed properly it could be again.
4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?
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:





5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?			
Tell us why:			
5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?			
Tell us why:			
6a. What do you think of these proposals?			
Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.			
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.			
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).			
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by			







businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

- 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?
- 8. Do you have any other comments?