



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

**Written Feedback**

**Hibiscus and Bays Volume #7**

April 2024



<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Organisation Name</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
N/A	Individual Submissions Only	N/A

---



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18480**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**

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





#18480



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18480



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18481**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 this stadium - it needs to be done up so that rugby and entertainment can be there again - it is an asset

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18481



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18481



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18483**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**





#18483



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18483



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18484**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 facility in Albany which is the largest centre of the north and growing, easily linked from northwest. Why drive traffic into the city or Mt Eden when there's a facility that can be used without congestion or neighbourhoods being affected by noise. Run it properly and it will be a valuable resource

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18484



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#18484



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18485**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**





#18485



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18485



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18486**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 good for our community, lots of great functions held 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?**



#18486



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18486



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18487**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 stadium in its day was going well, was a place for events, like the All Blacks Vs Fiji

All Blacks Vs South Africa - Kids rugby, Red Bull Racing - North Harbour is a big area that's has a large population with no local - Place for people - In our area to get to events - This should be taken out of council - Hands and put back for the local body to look after - This was ruined when we went to a super City - Again ruined by council to change the stadium to allow for baseball - Ripped up all the seats on the far side then it all fell apart. - If anything we should improve the stadium to cover the otherside as well this will get more people in as well. - Long term more revenue - Perfect place to put a fully covered 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:**





#18487



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18487



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

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



**#18487**



## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18488**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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, I remember a time when so many events used to happen here. If the Stadium was back up to standard we would get more events happening on the shore and wouldn't be at a disadvantage like we are now. It's hard having to always travel to the other side of Auckland to go to an event, and sometimes after paying for the event I don't have money for transport. Plus I and a lot of others prefer to stay on the shore. It was created & built by locals, please let it stay here 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?**



#18488



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18488



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

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

## Local board priorities

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



**#18488**



8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18491**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 would like to see it finished....

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18491



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18491



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18493**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18493



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18493



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18494**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Hands off you greedy useless bunch of totally narrow sighted muppets. This stadium cannot come down, the ground cannot be sold because once gone its gone. There will come a time you realise we need one and it will be too expensive and no suitable land. It used to be brilliant. Even had an Opera there. Took my son to a Blues game there but under your leadership events have crumbled. I honestly don't know how you get hired or elected to make such a mess of everything. Bring back the bloody rubbish bins as well. You're not thinking for the future. Get you hands off this 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?**



#18494



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18494



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

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

## Local board priorities

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



**#18494**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18495**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18495



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18495



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18496**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is an asset to our community. It was once a top venue and was capable of holding major events. There is no reason why it cant happen again with the correct management and maintenance

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18496



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18496



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18497**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18497



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18497



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18498**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 sports, concerts and events. It takes a lot of travel and parking issues out of the equation for us, plenty of population on the North Shore to support having our own 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:**



#18498



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18498



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18500**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 miss the events that used to be held at the stadium. The local community needs this venue for entertainment and to generate more money for the local economy from the people who visit the area. The stadium and grounds can be used for multiple activities from sports, entertainment, conferences and could be used by schools and clubs

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18500



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18500



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18501**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18501



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18501



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18502**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 easy to get to with buses just down the road. Our future sport stars on the North Shore would have somewhere to call a home ground. Work with Massey University and create a Sports Institute at the stadium to develop Elite sports people from our local young talent to be able to make North Harbour a sports power 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:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18502



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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





#18502



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18506**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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'd like to actually go to events that are close to home for a change. Should have more concerts since it so close to the bus stations. Mt Eden and Mt Smart are a nightmare 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:**



#18506



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#18506



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18507**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18507



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18507



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18509**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 of the bridge deserve better from this Council. This is our stadium. Better management would not see us in the position.

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18509



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18509



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18510**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18510



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18510



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18511**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18511



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18511



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18512**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 as its a fantastic venue for the North Shore to host sporting and other events. Easy to get too and great public transport with the Albany bus station not far from 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:**



#18512



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18512



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18513**



Tell us why:

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

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

**3. 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 believe it is a great asset and can be financially beneficial under better 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?**



#18513



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18513



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18514**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 to save the stadium

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18514



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18514



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18515**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 a huge asset in an area of Auckland where the population is growing massively. It's a facility that is well planned out and could once again be a vibrant incredible centre for the North Harbour region. Why on earth was it neglected in the first place? That is the real question and one that the council should answer to the people and ratepayers of North Harbour.

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18515



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#18515



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18519**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 Shore needs our own convenient stadium, we don't have the luxury of trains like other parts of Auckland, to access Eden Park or Mt.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?**



#18519



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18519



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18520**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 better management NHS can be a multi purpose stadium for kids, groups, codes and schools to play and celebrate sport. Sack the management team and appoint a board of specialialists who want the best for this 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:**



#18520



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18520



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18521**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18521



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18521



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18522**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 cost too much to build and is way too valuable to just tear down. We'll never get another stadium on the shore again if this goes. It needs to be returned to the vibrant venue it once was that was so well utilised. It was such an asset to the north shore when it was well run.

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18522



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#18522



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18524**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 fantastic with North Harbour Games and the All Blacks and League played there. Concerts etc. It is an absolute disgrace that the taxpayers and people of the North Shore do not have a world class venue liked they USED to. Complete disgrace and mismanagement. We want our stadium back to how ot used to be

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18524



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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





#18524



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18525**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 in a rapidly growing area of Auckland and should have world-class facilities available.

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18525



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18525



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18526**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 stadium that could be used a lot more. Would love to see it more active

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18526



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18526



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18528**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 beautiful and brings hope

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18528



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18528



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18531**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 need to be maintained and properly managed to be used by sports men and women for current and future generations. The stadium was paid for by the people of the North Shore and should be returned to them. Not taken away. Under proper management it can be be returned to it's former glory, to be used for many events. Council should also pay to reinstate the damage done to the stadium and rebuild the old stand

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18531



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#18531



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

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

## Local board priorities

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



**#18531**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18532**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18532



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18532



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18533**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 previously attended many events at the stadium before council took over. I believe the north shore and Auckland will benefit from a change of management and bringing back the 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:**





#18533



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18533



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18534**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 supercity is guilty of undermining a valuable asset. Leave it in place and hand the management to an organisation that is not totally focused on south 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:**

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



#18534



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18534



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18535**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 will use it if it is run properly. Not by 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?**





#18535



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18535



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18536**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18536



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18536



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18537**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

The council is too busy removing rubbish bins and reducing our services, whilst increasing our rates. They are not set up to effectively manage and run a large stadium complex like North Harbour Stadium. Any required proof is in the way they have allowed the stadium facility to be run down and largely unused, under their watch!

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**





#18537



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#18537



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18538**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 venue in a great location and would be a waste of our money to demolish such a young structure. Get it up and running again and see the money come back 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:**



#18538



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18538



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18540**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 too important and too. Much has been invested by ratepayers - do not want apartment blocks on any on sold land. Facility is for our 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?**





#18540



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18540



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18541**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 there since before I was born, it has held many memories and monumental games/events. It is also now the home base of super rugby team Moana Pasifika and that is significant in itself. Being the home base of a super rugby team and that being a Pasifika team shows how east coast bays and can be and should be a very diverse place to live. This can also show how Auckland council supports our Pasifika community. It is the only major stadium on the shore and having a pacific team based there with games being played there will bring people from all over the north shore and probably all over Auckland to come and use these facilities and watch games. There are so many more reasons to keep this stadium, putting this stadium "on the chopping block" should never be an option. An update of the facilities, grounds and stadium would be great but getting rid of it should not be the option!!

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18541



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18541



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

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



**#18541**



## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18544**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 in the Bays area deserve to have a facility where we may host major sport events and performing arts shows.

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18544



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18544



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18545**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18545



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18545



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18547**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18547



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18547



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18550**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 whole precinct & stadium must be saved exactly as it is today ( With the proviso that it is reinstated as it was in 1997) .. Plus new management with a targeted rate for Nth Shore residents . Perhaps \$10 per household per year...

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#18550



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18550



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18552**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 a huge local asset and I have very little confidence in Auckland council in its 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?**



#18552



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18552



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18553**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Council takes from the north to give to the south Stop 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?**



#18553



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18553



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18554**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 local, it's near transport links. We don't have many non school sporting facilities 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?**



#18554



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18554



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18555**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18555



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18555



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18556**



Tell us why:

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

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

**3. 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 belongs to 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?**



#18556



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18556



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18557**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 icon on the shore that needs to be used more and made available for local 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?**



#18557



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18557



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18558**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

It is a fantastic location but is underutilized. Those of us who live North of the stadium would love games, events and concerts 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?**



#18558



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18558



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18560**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 theres nothing wrong with it you just need to put back in the stands you demolished and actively start holding events and sports 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?**



#18560



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18560



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18561**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18561



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18561



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18562**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

No more houses. We need to utilize this space as an events and sports 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?**



#18562



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18562



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18563**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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:**



#18563



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18563



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18565**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 been 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?**



#18565



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18565



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18566**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 communities on North Shore. When events are held, they are well supported. Why should we have to travel to Eden Park or Mt Smart for everything?

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#18566



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18566



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?



**#18567**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

**3. 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 built with the support of Northshore residents and has been neglected and under funded since the formation of the super 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?**



#18567



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18567



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

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

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?





**#18568**



**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Having more sporting events here would bring in a lot of local revenue to the surrounding 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?**



#18568



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18568



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

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

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18569**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 invaluable and if lost will never be replaced 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?**



#18569



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18569



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18570**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18570



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18570



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18571**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18571



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18571



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18574**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium was built on the basis that it would be a location for major sporting events in the growing North Shore area. The shore has grown and expanded massively since then but has had less and less access to major events. Using this stadium properly will show how the northern busway was a great investment and the families in the north shore have a massive asset to make use of. Sporting events and other events such as food and wine, concerts etc need to be held 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?**



#18574



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#18574



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#18574**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18578**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 home of North Harbour Rugby.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18578



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18578



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18579**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 emblem of Northshore, needs to be managed and promoted better to make it the magnificent place it is.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18579



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18579



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18580**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 belongs to 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?**



#18580



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18580



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18582**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 better management it could be a real asset for 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?**



#18582



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18582



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18583**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 paid fir it. You broke 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?**



#18583



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18583



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18584**



Tell us why:

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 to be run by an organization

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18584



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18584



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18586**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18586



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18586



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18587**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 population is only increasing and the Shore needs a venue like this - there is so much opportunity.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18587



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18587



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18589**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Albany/North shore needs this stadium 100%

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18589



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18589



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18590**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 the Stadium. It would be senseless to demolish 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?**



#18590



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18590



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18591**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18591



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18591



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18592**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18592



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18592



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18593**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 amount of development on the North Shore means that the population that lives north of the bridge has grown exponentially & need their own stadium for sport & entertainment events. These residents pay rates & their needs must be primary.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18593



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18593



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18595**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

So important to have and draw community events. I've had so many fun memories at the stadium it just needs better organising.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18595



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18595



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18596**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 stadium. There should be a lot of sports being played there, it's the shame of the rugby union and other sports unions there isn't. Put the seating back on the other side, it's never going to be a baseball stadium 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:**



#18596



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18596



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18599**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 works! Don't break down something that is not broken!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18599



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18599



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18600**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 essential that the stadium is returned to the condition it was in prior to the changes made to accommodate baseball so that it can once again operate sustainably for the benefit of Shore residents as was intended by the trust that built the stadium. We must retain 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:**



#18600



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18600



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18602**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 know the history, including the funding by the community, of this valuable community facility AND mismanagement under current structure. It's capable of much greater things for the increasing community size around this area which is a good distance from any other stadiums including cbd. Should also be supported and allowed to reach its potential to continue giving a variety of options closer to the community and avoid travel and traffic over a greater distance

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18602



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	



#18602



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#18602**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18605**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The council are a bunch of Plonkers!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18605



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	





#18605



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18606**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18606



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18606



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18607**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 of tax payer dollars to demolish what is already there. It would be more beneficial to change the operational management of the stadium. Could be a more viewed as environmentally better, cheaper option with the ability under new management to encourage more frequent use of the facilities both by sports, entertainment and business this could in turn increase the overall revenue of the facility.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18607



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	





#18607



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#18607**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18608**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 a growing population North Shore needs this stadium. It should be finished & used to host sporting & entertainment 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?**



#18608



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18608



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18613**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 wonderful to have a local stadium but it's a great shame it has been run down and under utilised

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**





#18613



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18613



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18614**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18614



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18614



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18615**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**





#18615



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18615



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18619**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18619



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18619



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18622**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 it as it is. Once it is gone, we won't get it back.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**





#18622



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18622



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18623**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 is growing and needs facilities for everyone, it's crazy to demolish a stadium, especially the only one on the north shore, it has transport links around Auckland including north of Auckland that also doesn't have a stadium. It's very short sighted and previously was run well under the previous body.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18623



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18623



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18627**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**





#18627



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18627



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18628**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18628



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18628



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18629**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 I was part of the original management team. The team worked so hard to ensure great activities were on offer and engagement with locals. As soon as council took over it's been purposely abandoned and gone to ruin. We're tired of having to go for miles to sports fixtures and concerts. I'd happily go back and run the place to make it the best stadium in Auckland. It's such an asset it will be a crime to waste it. Change the governance and get commercial management in!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**





#18629



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#18629



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#18629**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18630**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 only stadium on North Shore, built essentially by the community, not Councils, would not have gone into disrepair or a low priority promotion pre amalgamation

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18630



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18630



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18631**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 belongs to North Shore. We paid for it and hate the way it has been 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?**



#18631



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18631



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18633**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 think that we should keep this stadium because it is the best stadium to watch rugby on the North Shore and if it is demolished Albany would look incomplete. Its a wonderful multi-purpose venue to host sports and music festivals and it is a venue that locals fought very hard to get.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18633



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18633



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18634**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 fantastic resource that we need to use and enjoy.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18634



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18634



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18636**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Would be a waste of money to get rid of such a great 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?**



#18636



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18636



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18639**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 a great local facility & we attended many sporting, entertainment events here. Brings vibrancy & money to local economy. Great transport links are close by. The hassle of getting to & from downtown/ city sport's and entertainment events which don't have great or reliable infrastructure puts us off going and supporting local teams.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18639



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18639



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18643**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18643



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18643



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18645**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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's the point in changing 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?**



#18645



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18645



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18646**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18646



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18646



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18647**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 awesome stadium where you can get up close to the players. More big matches need to be played there. Develop the other sides of the stadium as per the original plans and get big matches & big name concerts/events there. It's a great 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:**



#18647



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18647



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18648**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 family raised funds for this stadium and we want it to be used again. It's close to the motorway, handy for all of Auckland to use.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18648



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18648



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?





**#18652**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

northshore residents have paid for the stadium through their rates. we will never be able to afford to purchase land , and build a new stadium. the stadium need to stay. the stadium is a community asset , and should not be seen as a chance for some easy money for the council. the proposed new stadium in wynyard is a stroking some architects / designers ego , with features that dont serve any purpose , those same features will be difficult and expense to maintain.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18652



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#18652



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#18652**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if 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?



**#18653**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18653



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18653



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18654**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 an events centre where it is affordable to take families to like NPC games. Our children have loved being a part of on field activities, keeping them connected with sports and the community. Make it work.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18654



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18654



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18655**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 vital piece of infrastructure that the locals love. Keeps traffic of the roads and as we have no trains on the shore getting to Eden Park is an absolute shit show and a nightmare (2.5 hrs to get back to Albany bus station after the recent Pink Concert) . It was a shambles (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:**



#18655



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18655



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18658**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 stadium on the Shore for sporting events and other important functions.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18658



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18658



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18663**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 local icon. We need the management to come back to local residents who can repair, upgrade as needed and get amazing events booked. It could be a shining star for Auckland if given a chance.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18663



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18663



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18665**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 to stay. It belongs to the north shore. Council cannot just run things into the ground and decide to destroy it. Im very proud to have worked on the original construction of this magnificent stadium. Long my it stay.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18665



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18665



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18666**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 part of the North Shore- even watching World Cup matches there. Can not knock it down !

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18666



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18666



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18667**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

North Harbour Stadium is the only Stadium we have on our North Shore. In the past the Stadium was used for many international and local team sports. As a ratepayer our local businesses, buses, trains etc will be disadvantaged, not looking at the next generation- up and coming sports player. Auckland Council leave the park 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:**



#18667



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18667



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18668**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18668



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18668



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18669**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 part of the North Shore community for ages. I have attended world class events here and do not wish for it to be demolished .

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18669



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18669



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18671**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Its an iconic venue in North Shore sports. We must save 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?**



#18671



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18671



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18672**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 labour of love. We went to the memorable opening so great memories

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18672



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18672



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18673**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This is a great facility that should be optimized for more events. Public transport is already there, shore residents shouldn't have to always travel over the bridge to get entertainment. It is so short sighted to consider removing this facility with all the growth happening further north as well.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18673



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18673



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18675**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Purpose built stadium and conference rooms not utilized 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:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18675



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18675



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18676**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

We have been living on the Shore for 23 years and have been to a lot of functions at North Harbour

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18676



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18676



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18677**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Fast growth area needs a stadium that is properly managed

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18677



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18677



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18678**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 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?**



#18678



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18678



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18679**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18679



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18679



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18680**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 able to be used by sport teams and for concerts and social events. It was financed by locals and we should have the say in how it is used and operated. It is utterly ridiculous to think of this great venue being scrapped.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18680



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18680



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18682**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 locals built it. The locals like it. It is a super asset

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18682



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18682



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18683**



Tell us why:

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 not yours to do with as you 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?**



#18683



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18683



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18685**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 sports facility that with correct management can be world class holding major events. This should not be to the people to have to fight for better management and enjoyment of a stadium with great location and public transport but should be enjoyed by all.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#18685



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18685



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18686**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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:**



#18686



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#18686



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18688**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 one of the few (possibly only) stadia in Auckland that has decent parking options and close to a transport hub. It is a great option for medium size events. It is centred around a bunch of facilities (pool/sports fields) that are well used by the community. It backs on to an oval that would be a perfect cricket test venue for 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:**



#18688



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#18688



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18689**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 paid for this stadium and if managed correctly it's a great place for sports 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?**



#18689



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18689



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18690**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 fantastic venue, well situated near public transport. It just needs operational improvements.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18690



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18690



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

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?



**#18691**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. 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 belongs to us as ratepayers. It has greater potential than what is currently given. We owe it to our children to promote the enjoyment and participation in a range of sports.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#18691



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#18691



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increase council services, introduce technology techniques especially artificial intelligence. Increase productivity and quality of service.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18842**



Reduce the frequency of busses in midnight for most of the regions, avoid lots of empty busses that create waste.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meet the requirement of Auckland transport development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase free carparking spaces and the number of carparks.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management structure, reduce the number of empty busses at midnight.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

Meet the need of transport fund of Auckland convenient to manage and practical operation.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18842**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18842



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18842



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't suggest to raise land tax our living pressure is too high.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18842



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	A lot of priority rates already gave us citizens too much living pressure, is already a lot of burden.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18844**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase business, ensure bus drivers' team is stable, prevent cancelation of service.

**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:**

Keep the already existing swimming pool . The swimming pool is too small. If most good condition hope can rebuild.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Hope City Council has enough financial source. Keep stable income for long term.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council





**#18844**



**Tell us here:**

I am satisfied the management of Auckland port. I worry if it is rent out it may have operational consequences.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

That City Council's responsibility!

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18844



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18844



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18845**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase expenditure on public transport, encourage public transport venues for replace private cars.

**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:**

Maintain the swimming people. If possible enlarge the swimming pool venue.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Should through increase manufacturing, elements development to increase government's income.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#18845**



**Tell us here:**

I am better satisfied on the operation of the limited company of port.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Trust City Council!

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18845



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18845



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18846



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Control for traffic congestion and car parks.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cancel or reduce those bus routes which are inefficient.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Redevelop: providing better service for Northshore and Auckland's community needs.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I am not able to read parts of the document so I can't have any say.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#18846



**Tell us here:**

Because future is far away, has lots of uncertainty, it is more important to do the tasks right now.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

keeping the original mode.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

unable to read parts of consultation document, I cant give any opinion.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	Do not support
---	----------------



#18846

<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#18846



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.

Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.

Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on



#18846



<p>the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>1. Education to house owner and renters of the risks from climate change. 2. Let Auckland transport complete transportation to CBD.</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Because I am unable to read different contents, so I can't give more useful comments.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18847**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?**





#18847



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate



#18847



<p>from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18847**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

City Council service

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18848**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

Now it is urgent to improve the situation of traffic congestion.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

At non-busy areas, add more car parking spaces.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Temporarily reduce the investment of cycleway project.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

Can keep the stadium and can also change the operation management.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable, can activate this funds, showing bigger and more obvious benefit.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**



#18848



This item can guarantee operation independent, can control benefit distribution.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

Directly subsidise City Council's sources, more easy and convenient.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

**Tell us why:**

Return to City Council for other uses. Showing potential create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
--	----------------



#18848



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#18848**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#18849**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Can first start with most urgent issue.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the restructure of public transport and cycleway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#18849



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Easy and convenient.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#18849



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.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



**#18849**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the number of busses at night, Reduce waste.



**#18850**



## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

### **Tell us why:**

Because heightened walking and cycling don't have meaning. Cost is too high

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Regional fuel tax increase council's funding source.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify buss management structure, reduce the number of empty busses.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

### **Tell us why:**

Because stadium at the moment is enough for use.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### **Tell us why:**

There will be risks to transfer AIAL share, will be a mess and become monopoly.

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#18850**



**Tell us here:**

Because those who rent quality's is not clear, and can be easily interfere with gangs, affects life quality.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Can reduce the financial pressure from increase land tax and other fees, at the same time ease long process from citizens.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I don't agree on the "future fund".

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

public space is already enough.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

If build another port, abandon the original port, making more waste of funds.





#18850



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18850



Change 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.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't support adding land tax, our living pressure is too much.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18850



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Lots of priority items already give us too much pressure, the burden is too much .

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

basic facilities of city

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

unnecessary repair work.



**#18852**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#18852



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Reasonably use of resource available.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Reasonably use of resources.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	<p>Support</p>
--	----------------



#18852



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



**#18852**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do less
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrade of roading and public transport. Not only about safety, most important to keep free flow.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18853**



Extend the period of work of Mayor, reduce the issues of funding and management caused by election. LOT Mayor has enough time to manage target.

**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?**

Protection of road and public green land can undergo management according to situational

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

new that stadium usage is not high, should consider now to increase usage.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable, can activate that fund, display bigger and more risks benefit.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18853**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city council for other uses, brighter display is potential more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18853



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18853



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Use for enhancing community safety and social security becomes better. Use for improving medical and health their facilities and resource.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#18854**



## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

### **Tell us why:**

Most aspects are now urgent. Enhancing the improvement of traffic congestion

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

At non-buy areas, increase free parking car services appropriately.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Temporarily reduce the investment in cycle way project.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

### **Tell us why:**

Can change the operation management, effectively increase ways of income and project.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable can activate that funds sharing bigger benefit.

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#18854



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

This project can guarantee operations independence, can control practically of benefit distribution. Rental period too lengthy exists a very big uncertainty.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Directly used to subsidise city council services, easier and more convenient. If invest into Auckland future funds. Money may lose.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city council for other uses, bigger showing their potential, create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know





#18854



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18854



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18855**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#18855



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18855



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18855**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

NO





**#18856**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#18856



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18856



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



**#18856**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Pollution, each shopping mall to use plastic bags which cannot be recycled. Reduce carbon pollution.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18857**



Arrangement of public transport.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Quite good

**2a. Is there anything you 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:**

Keeping the same stadium, costs are not low, a lot of facilities getting old.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Regarding to investment, looking for resource is not enough.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



**#18857**



**Tell us here:**

I don't understand about this.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

No

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city Council, create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18857



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#18857



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18857



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Because regional board's priority items are mostly beneficial our regional development.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18858**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18858



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#18858



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



**#18858**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Reduce some lazy people's benefit, let them do hard work. Young people get benefit will increase council's pressure

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#18859**



Elderly card don't change once every half year, is too much. Too waste of letter paper and envelope.

**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?**

Have to manage these scooters on the road, have to lock it.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The stadium's existence is very important, at school holiday children will have venues for different sports.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

The important thing is NZ country control the Airport.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18859**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Maintain council all authority.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#18859



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18859



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1. Auckland City council can make plans to develop economy. 2. Hope Auckland City Council can reduce living costs for all residents.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18860**



Inflation, cost of living.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Complete rapid express way project.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Reduce bus routes when are in low efficiency. Stop heightened pedestrian walkway.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Please keep the swimming pool.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce flooding, protect waterway. Enhance different types of community projects.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18860**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

professional matters should let professionals to do.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Same as above.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#18860



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>





#18860



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18860



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fight for funding and support Orewa beach project.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18861**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#18861



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18861



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18861**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?





**#18862**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18862



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18862



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18862**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Road and public transport upgrade not only because of safety the most important is keeping free flow.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18863**



Extending the job length of mayor, reduce the problem of funds and management caused by election, let mayor has more time to manage targets.

**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?**

Keeping the road and public greenland, undergo management according to situation

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Now that stadium usage is not high, should think of solutions in order to increase usage.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable. Can receive and activate that funds displaying bigger and more obvious benefit.



**#18863**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city council for other uses displaying bigger potential create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#18863



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>





#18863



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Quicker to do more on public transport, reduce waiting time, be more punctual. Park facilities should suit everyone, such as more public to lees.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#18864



By activities funding should provide less a lot of festivals, council can spend less.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

invest in rapid traffic management. Let public transport system getting more faster and convenient.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Complete the bus station with electric billboard and seats. That passenger have some to wait for busses. L

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Low usage of cycleway, should reduce expense

## 3. 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 charges reasonable fees, change operation management.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:



**#18864**



maintain status, avoid rates.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I agree continue by City Council corporation to operate port. Keep all basic authorities for use council port, land and pier.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

With basic all authorities can increase City council's profit and directly let Auckland's Construction become better.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Didn't change easily as the business of the port is immature.



#18864



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

it think it is very good now.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#18864



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#18864



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	support most priority items. Extend community recyclable centre, rubbish collection Service

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

- ii support giving each region's city council fair of funding distribution.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18865**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Complete expressway project at present

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce low efficient public transport=rt network, stop heightening of walkway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Please keep the swimming pool

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce flooding, protection of waterway, providing every types of services, fulfil, effective management to increase investment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#18865**



**Tell us here:**

Professional matters should let professional staff to do

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Same as above

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18865



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18865



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18865



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Orewa is tight for funding and support to complete orewa beach regional coastline development project.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduction of technology techniques. Increase productivity and quality of services.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce buses from remote and less populated regions.



**#18866**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

Fulfil needs of Auckland transport demands

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Set up appropriate bus station

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management structure, reduce empty busses in midnight

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

At that region there are lots of residents, have to maintain plenty of sport facilities and activities venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

Fulfil the need of Auckland to transfer funds convenient to manage and operate.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

City council manage and operate these enterprises themselves.



#18866



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Can reduce the increase of land tax and other fees' financial pressure.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Change operation make these assts become bigger.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

This business district brings employment and loading goods conveniently for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support





#18866



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#18866



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.
--

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Essential to set up specific items of land tax, source of finance for protection of environment.

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on	



#18866



<p>the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>These priority items fully reflect needs of residents and direction of distinct development.</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build railway between Northshore and Auckland city. Think long term (not 10 to 20 years) at 100 years. Build more green infrastructure. Solar panel, charging poles for e-cars.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18867**



Do not waste money on meaningless things. Take on actions rather than endless discussions and consultations.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#18867



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#18867



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#18867**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Hope city council can change the tax revenue policy. More planning and criteria, source of income.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18868**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Hope the venue at present can be utilised well. Don't waste money under a not used condition

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#18868



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

Hope city council can change mindset, put economy development into consideration.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Can support City's council source of income

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#18868



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18868



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Have to consider the revenue from land tax, family balanced finance.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	



#18868



<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>The increase of revenue of land tax must link to family's income and expenditure.</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#18869**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#18869



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Do not support



#18869



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



**#18869**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

At council service bring into more technology techniques, especially artificial intelligence, raising efficiency and service quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18870**



Reduce the frequency of busses at midnight in most of the regions.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The aspect fulfil the Development needs for Auckland transposer.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase free car parking and number of carparks.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT's management structure, reduce the number of empty busses at midnight.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

At these region there are numerous of residents, need to maintain plenty of sport facilities and have activities venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The aspect fulfil the need of managing funds in Auckland easy to manage and practical functioning.



**#18870**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council City Government related enterprise, let government to run themselves can see the participation of citizens.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Can relieve the financial burden of increase land tax and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Through changing operation more, let assets create bigger benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#18870



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

This region brings employment and convenience of loading goods for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#18870



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Needs to set up specific land tax, can maintain environment management which needs keeping finance resource

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?





#18870



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These Priority items fully reflect needs of residents and the direction of regional development

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Hope City Council reduce the salaries of members of council, truly serve all citizens

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do less about these projects not practical, reduce land tax, fuel tax and service tax.



#18871



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Please keep the swimming pool unchanged. don't cut the service.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#18871



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#18871



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#18871**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce AI, advanced tech facilities, raising service ability and level

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18872**



Reduce unnecessary repeated working efficiency.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Match the development necessities.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase car parks care for the elderly and children's convenience.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

More people do the job makes low efficiency.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Open more different activities venues for teenagers

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Fulfil the efficiency of fund investment, put some effort from management level.





**#18872**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Be good to all citizens and teenagers participation level, convenient & them.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Let the fund more advantaged for growth of teenager.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Let the benefit of funds more effective.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#18872



**Tell us why:**

Create conditions for employment and raising efficiency.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#18872



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It's necessary to set up special project land tax.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	
--	--



#18872



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	First priority item must more reflect on the growing needs of teenagers.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Be good for everyone's taking port and care about city council policy enforcement. Let officials be responsible is necessary.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18873**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Complete the project of expressway.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the low efficient public transport and network. Stop heightening of walkway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Please keep the swimming pool.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce flooding, protection of waterway, providing different types of service, fulfil effective management for increase investment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#18873**



**Tell us here:**

Professional matters should let professional people to do

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Same as above.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18873



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#18873



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18873



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Fight for funding and support to complete Orewa beach region's coastline Development project.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduction of more technology techniques, raising efficiency.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce some unnecessary events, save expense.



**#18874**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meet the requirement of Auckland transport development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase car park space.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the expenditure of cycleway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Have to maintain enough sport 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meet investment needs.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18874**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Maintain City Council all authorities of port land and terminal.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Have basial whole authorities, can manage City Council's profit and dividend.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

it is very good now, very mature.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

This business district can bring employment opportunity to Auckland.



#18874



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18874



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18874



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Support most of the priority items.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Support giving each regional council more fair of fund distribution.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I hope council can introduce more technology techniques. Fully use advanced technology, raising up job efficiency and quality of service.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18875**



Reduce remote and less populated areas buses. To avoid waste of resource.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Prospect fulfil the needs of Auckland transport of development

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Make it easy for all residents to go out, have to set up bus stops reasonably.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

simplified AT management structure, reduce the number of empty busses at midnight.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There are a lot of people living at that region have to maintain plenty of sport facilities and activities venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Aspect fulfil the need of Auckland's investment, in order to manage and actual operation.



**#18875**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council related industry to be operated by council, can show the participation of citizens.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Can relieve the increased land tax and other fees' financial pressure.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Through changing operation mode, let the funds create the biggest benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#18875



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The industry region can bring employment and loading goods convenience for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Do not support



#18875



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to set up particular land tax, can maintain the upgoing financial resources for manage of environment.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#18875



<p>Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.</p>	
<p>Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.</p>	
<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>These priority items totally reflect needs of residents and the direction of regional development.</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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?



**#18876**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

keep stadium the same state or can change operation management, swimming pool must stay, can't cut stress.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**





#18876



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#18876



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#18876**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



**#18877**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#18877



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

With funding create public benefit.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Do not support



#18877



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18877**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Investment more on roads and transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18878**



Extend the city mayor's job's length. Reduce the mismanagement of funds caused by election. Mayor system manages the good timing.

**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?**

Have to protect Free land, advanced management according to situation.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Maintain the facilities of swimming pools please don't make any changes, don't cut the services.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Easy for future management.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18878**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Changing the city council for other uses, bigger shown its potential, create bigger public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#18878



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18878



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Provide less funding for big events, festivals are a lot, Council can pay less.



**#18879**



**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?**

A complicated public bus station with electric board and seats, a good place for passengers to wait.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The wage of cycling is lowered. Should reduce expenditure.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium should change/reasonably, change operation management.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The aspect is workable, can activate that funds. Showing bigger and more benefits.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18879**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Can basically ensure all authorities, can obtain bigger benefit.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city council for other uses, bigger showing its potential, create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**





#18879



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18879



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18880**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18880



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#18880



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



**#18880**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

In many aspect of council services have to/ raise productivity and service quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the public transport frequency at midnight in some areas.





**#18881**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meet required need of Auckland transport development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase free carparking and the number of carparks.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the AT management structure, reduce empty busses at night.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know, so I'm not 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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland International Airport's shares has Auckland's long term financial value.



**#18881**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Operate by professional company, on achievement effectiveness and benefit will have big improvement.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Can let that funds for the operation of City Council.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Through the shift of operation lost asset to better benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#18881



**Tell us why:**

This district can bring employment and loading goods convenient for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18881



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Need to set up specific items on land tax, can maintain the funding for protection of Environment.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrade of roads and public transport, not only for safety the most important is to keep free flow.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18883**



Extend the job period of Mayor. Reduce the trouble of funds and management caused by election. let Mayor can manage his targets in an effective time.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road and green land usage is not high. Should consider houses to raise the use.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Now the stadium usage is not high, should consider how to raise the use.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is good, can activate that funds displaying bigger and more obvious benefits.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18883**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return council for other uses, bigger displaying potential, create more public benefits.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18883



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#18883



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18884**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

increase expenditure on public transport, prevent services being cancelled.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Hope can reduce expenditure on cycleway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Hope keeping the swimming pool district. If meets requirement, I hope the swimming area can be enlarged.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I feel that City Council should have enough income source, use to build the city.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18884**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

At present the operational management of ports is very good. If rent it out and, we worry about the rental side is not as good as before.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

That City Council won't let us.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#18884



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18884



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Hope inflation went go up too quick, let citizens pay a bit less.



**#18885**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Upgrade network, reduce traffic control.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase expenses in public transport, let citizens going out easily.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

In Auckland, very few people cycling, no need to wate money on the cycleway project.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Keep swimming pool unchanged, no cut off of services.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

So there will be more funding to refurbish Auckland airport.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#18885**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Can be better operate the port.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Use profits and dividends to serve citizens, specific use from specific funds.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

So let the port better finds out its use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#18885



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18885



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18886**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Do not demolish the stadium pool or suspend its operation if the option of restructuring the stadium and rebuild it was chosen.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Would trust a more professional corporation to manage the port.



#18886



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#18886



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#18886**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18887**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Complete express public transport highway project

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce low efficient public transport new=work, stop heightened walkway.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Keep the swimming pool

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Provide waterway provide different types of social services.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#18887



Tell us here:

Expert matters should let experts to do

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Expert matters should let experts to do

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#18887



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18887



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on	



#18887



<p>the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>Fight for fundings and support completion of Orewa beach project.</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

NO



**#18888**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

This stadium at the moment doesn't find out its potential use. Should invest and rebuild, look for good usage. Great value.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Airport bus station, bus terminal all are important state owned assets.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#18888**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

All rights cannot be changed rental management should use better benefit ways reveal rights should be strictly managed.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Should continue to manage Auckland port, can benefit Auckland city's development. Also an important point for govt to work hard.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to city council let them for other uses. Find out its potential, create better public interest.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#18888



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#18888



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	
--	--



#18888



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Because most priority items are very important to our regions development! Enhancing quicker and better development

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Use for enhancing community safety and the aspects of society security becoming better. Use for improving medicine and health and their facilities and resource.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18889**



No

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because the matters are new in urgent needs they can enhance the improvement of traffic congestion.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

At some non-busy areas add more free carparks accordingly.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Temporarily reduce the investment of cycleway project

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Can change the operation management appropriately can be effective to increase ways of income and projects

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable



**#18889**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

This option can guarantee the authority of operation, can actually control the distribution of benefit. Rental period too long that very big uncertainty exists.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Council services is more simply and convenient.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return to council for other uses, bigger expression of their potential, create more public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#18889



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support





#18889



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
---	--



#18889



<p>Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.</p>	
<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>Where I live is far away from CBD, if quicker and better developed, can become district centre, increase social function</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce AI, advanced tech facilities, raising service ability and level

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18890**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

In the community citizens need sport facilities and activities venues, can also make some changes in operation management

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Operation authority rental period 35 years is too lengthy, try short term first.



#18890



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#18890



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#18890**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Specific items of land tax can be combined set up resource protection tax.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18891**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#18891



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18891



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#18891**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#18892



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

This stadium at this stage does not show it's potential should invest and rebuild displaying it's great value!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Airport, bus station, port, pier are belonged to Govt, they must be strictly supervised, they can not be used for investment

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18892**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

All rights are unchanged, rental is a way of management, through change of way of management to get.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Can provide better service to citizens

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Should develop and enlarge port infrastructure. How come it will diminish its strength?  
Sea transport must be better than train and vehicles!



#18892



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>





#18892



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18893**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

City council controls these matters in their own hands so it's not guarantee the funding is received.



#18893



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18893



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



**#18893**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

In Northshore first to solve traffic problems. Hope city council concern about economy development.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18894**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Now the stadium is fully used, if build another district is waste of money

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

If sold the assets only have money in a short period in the future source of fund will no more, not good for long term development.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#18894**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Hope city council can change their concepts, considering economy development

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Keep the original status can have economy revenue to support councils economic conditions.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18894



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18894



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Increase land tax must consider family financial balance.

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18894



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	I do not support most of the fees, tax policy they are closely linked to family income and expenditure.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18895**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public road pass through homes, need to increase investment.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Change operation management, let the stadium receive income, fully utilise resource available for serving citizens.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#18895



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#18895



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support





**#18895**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build railway between Northshore and Auckland city. Think long term (not 10 to 20 years) at 100 years. Build more green infrastructure. Solar panel, charging poles for e-cars.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18896**



Do not waste money on meaningless things. Take on actions rather than endless discussions and consultations.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#18896



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
--	--



#18896



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools.**

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#18896**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce the introduction of advanced technological tools

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18897**



Reduce unnecessary roadwork, raising work efficiency.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Should be able to fulfil the needs of the development

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase transport investment for schools, elderly and children

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Department which is in low working efficiency

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Must open every types of activities venues, free for teenager and make them happy

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Bring into the efficiency of raising funds, put some effort in management level.





**#18897**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Convenient and benefit to all citizens.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Let funds better serve the growth of teenager.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Effectively let funds running

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#18897



Tell us why:

For employment and raising benefit to create condition

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#18897



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Necessarily to set up specific item of land tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who	
--	--



#18897



does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Priority items should reflect more social development, especially beneficial to growth of teenagers.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Enforce the responsibility of council staff, keep an eye on the work of every item.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal



**#18898**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#18898



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18898



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#18898**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18899**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18899



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#18899



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18899**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?



**#18900**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT Card: Increase swipe credit card/ money card function

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Can improve long-term financial status, fully use the assets.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**





#18900



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
---	---------------------



#18900



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#18900**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?

Reduce the frequency of busses at night in most areas, to avoid a lot of empty busses that is a waste.



**#18901**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meet the requirement of Auckland transport development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

increase free carpark spaces and number of carparks.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

simplify AT management structure, reduce the number of empty busses at night.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

At West region there are a lot of residents. Need to maintain plenty of sports facilities and big events venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland International Airport shares is long term financial value of Auckland.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#18901



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

these enterprise relate to City council let council to run because is better to citizens.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Can relieve financial burden from receiving more land tax and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Change of port will bring difficulty of protecting environment cost of rebuild not easy to control.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#18901



**Tell us why:**

At that place can be used to develop exhibition, venue for big events.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support



#18901



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
---	--





#18901



<p>Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.</p>	
<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>These Priority items fully reflect needs of residents and the direction of regional development</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#18902**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most aspects are now urgent. Enhancing the improvement of traffic congestion

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Temporarily reduce the investment of cycleway project

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Can keep the current status, can make changes in operation management appropriately, can increase income affectively.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This aspect is workable can activate that funds sharing bigger benefit.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#18902**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

This guarantee all authorities and receive bigger benefits.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Return council for other uses, bigger displaying potential, create more public benefits.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#18902



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#18902



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#18902



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Because most priority items are also important to my region, I hope my remote region can have development.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#18903**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#18903



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#18903



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#18903**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18904**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium must be fully used resource for serving customers and create income.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#18904



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#18904



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support





**#18904**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?



**#18905**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

For AT tag card: increase swipe credit card/money card function

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cancel or reduce those bus routes which are in low efficiency.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Our Auckland International Airport shares and rental period of 35 years will bring financial benefit to council.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#18905



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#18905



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#18905**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrade of roads and public transport, not only for safety the most important is to keep free flow.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18907**



Extend the period of Mayor, reduce the issues of funding and management caused by election. Mayor has enough time to achieve target.

**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?**

Preauction of kerbside and green land.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

we stadium usage is not high, should consider increase usage.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#18907**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#18907



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#18907



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#18909**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium needs to be fully used with resource available. Serve citizens and create income.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:**



#18909



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#18909



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#18909**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	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?



**#18919**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

More bus route and more bus stop also train services

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

To do more convenient to travel by bus and train to be right time and put more bus stop that noy yet reach.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#18919



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#18919



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#18919**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing 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?**

Looking forward to invest in every proposal that Auckland council do and to be successful and profit and bring back to public.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	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?

Need to prepare for disaster.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18920**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

sell to company or person who has money

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Lease it and get more money then can use that for other things.



#18920



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Council don't have to hold it if someone can take care of it

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by





#18920



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



**#18920**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing 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?**

I hope the rate goes to good things for everyone and AKI goes to better than now.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#18935**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#18935



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#18935



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



**#18935**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Revitalizing healthcare systems such as hospital.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#19028**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#19028



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#19028



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



**#19028**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transportation; Improvement of the overall roads of the transportation network.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#19030**



Economic and cultural development; Funding and economic development for major events.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#19030



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#19030



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	I don't know
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support





**#19030**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#19054**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#19054



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#19054



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#19054**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Expansion of medical facilities.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#19071



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It would be great to have clear investment goals and policies established.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#19071



In the first case; pollution seems to be a concern.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Using it for something else would cause pollution problems.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#19071

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



**#19071**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Preservation of the ecosystem and species means a pristine NZ.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

It would be great to establish a local hospital.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

doesn't exist.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#19221**



I would like to see a reduction in the excessive allocation of city buses during rush hour.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I wish construction on the PenLink road would proceed more quickly.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

doesn't exist.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#19221



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#19221



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#19221**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing 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?**

Please finish the PenLink road construction quickly.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Agree on investment costs to prevent natural disasters.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#19225**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#19225



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#19225



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#19225**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Restoration of natural environment

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

City Council Support



**#19239**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#19239



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support





#19239



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#19239**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21258**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#21258



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21258



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#21258**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

release more land

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#21317**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#21317



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#21317



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



**#21317**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?



**#21319**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#21319



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21319



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#21319**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21478**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#21478



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Do not support



#21478



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#21478**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21489**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

traffic jam

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#21489



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21489



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



**#21489**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As 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?

Minimize consultancy, save wherever possible, use existing office equipment unless necessary to replace, streamline personnel, and avoid inefficiency work



**#21518**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Flexibly utilize resources, make the most of what's available, and avoid begging for handouts while holding a golden rice bowl

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#21518



Tell us here:

Effective management involves managing finances wisely, investing in assets that generate revenue, and allowing money to work to generate more money

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#21518



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#21518



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.
--

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Act more, speak less, and deliver on promises

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped





#21518



reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	The accountability system is good, but for a long time, no one seems to have been held accountable. To streamline administration and reduce redundant personnel would suffice

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21520**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#21520



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21520



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#21520**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21555**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services





#21555



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount



#21555



<p>for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21555**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Control crime

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the cost of expert consultation for big projects



**#21558**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#21558



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#21558



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



**#21558**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Control crime, Improve efficiency

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the cost of expert consultation for big projects



**#21583**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Tell us why:

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Tell us why:

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Tell us why:

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#21583



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21583



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21583**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21609**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#21609



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	





#21609



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21620**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#21620



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#21620



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	I don't know
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#21620**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?

Reduce the consulting fees for experts and consultants. Streamline the government's various departmental administrative expenses and downsize personnel



**#21627**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**





#21627



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#21627



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21672**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Increase the usage of the stadium

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

A lease term of 35 years is quite long, considering a lease term of 10 years



#21672



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Supporting both funding for city council services and investing in the Auckland Future Foundation to balance both. Profits and dividends can be used for consumption and investment

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	Support
---	---------



#21672



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



**#21672**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Try to minimize expert assessment costs; too much does not solve the problem

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#21675**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#21675



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#21675



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Suggest the government should reduce experts; the cost is too high

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21678**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#21678



4d. Do you have any feedback on 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#21678



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#21678**



8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21684**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Support maximizing the benefits of public property. A lease term of 35 years is quite long, considering a lease term of 10 years



#21684



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#21684



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#21684**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21701**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#21701



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>





#21701



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21701**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21712**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#21712



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21712



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21712**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#21717**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#21717



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21717



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21717**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21727**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#21727



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21727



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support





**#21727**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	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?

Suggesting the government and various institutions reduce expenditure on expert consulting fees



**#21767**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#21767



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#21767



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#21767**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?



**#21815**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**





#21815



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#21815



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#21815**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	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?



**#21817**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#21817



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#21817



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21817**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?



**#21827**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#21827



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#21827



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#21827**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21857**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#21857



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>





#21857



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21857**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#21962**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#21962



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21962



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#21962**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#22022**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22022



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#22022



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#22022**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#22027**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#22027



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#22027



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#22027**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal



**#22033**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#22033



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#22033



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#22033**



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22058**



Does the council truly serve its ratepayer by this action of up to 38% increase over 3 years to some regions?

I reject all three options for rate hikes. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to do their jobs properly and find cost savings for the rate payers and adding value for our money by explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A "lean" cut to get rid of unnecessary "fat" in throughout the council structure. Are there really 12 000+ staff needed to serve the rate payers? Are all the

A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.





**#22058**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

The Council is on so called "life-support" with a \$10 billion + debt hanging around its neck, and what are you as mayor doing to reduce it? A good

businessman will reduce debt, add value to the rate payers hard earned money, and LISTEN to the people it serves!

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

Does the council truly serve its ratepayer by this action of up to 38% increase over 3 years to some regions?

I reject all three options for rate hikes. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic

circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay



**#22058**



less, get less" option.

I strongly urge Councillors to do their jobs properly and find cost savings for the rate payers and adding value for our money by explore ways of

preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and

reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A "lean" cut to get rid of unnecessary "fat" in throughout the council structure. Are there really 12 000+ staff needed to serve the rate payers? Are all the

A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called "traffic calming measures" (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

The Council is on so called "life-support" with a \$10 billion + debt hanging around its neck, and what are you as mayor doing to reduce it? A good



**#22058**



businessman will reduce debt, add value to the rate payers hard earned money, and LISTEN to the people it serves!

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22058



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22058



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22058**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#22060



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22060**



COMMENCE A RIGOROUS REVIEW OF PROCESS TO ELIMINATE BEAURACRACY AND PC INVOMPETENCE. THE STARTING POINT WOULD BE A COMPULSORY BUDGET REDUCTION OF 33%. REVIEW ALL DECISION MAKING PROCESSES. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DECISION MAKING AT THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY. CANCEL ALL CONTRACTORS WHO PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR DECISION MAKING. NO MORE PASSING THE BUCK.

IF COUNCIL WERE COMMERCIALY RUN THERE WOULD BE RATES REDUCTIONS OR AT LEAST MONEY TO PAY FOR FAILING INFILSTRUCTURE.

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher





**#22060**



than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about



**#22060**



infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

COMMENCE A RIGOROUS REVIEW OF PROCESS TO ELIMINATE BEAURACRACY AND PC INVOMPETENCE. THE STARTING POINT WOULD BE A COMPULSORY BUDGET REDUCTION OF 33%. REVIEW ALL DECISION MAKING PROCESSES. MANAGEMENT AND STAFF SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR



**#22060**



DECISION MAKING AT THE FIRST OPPORTUNITY. CANCEL ALL CONTRACTORS WHO PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR DECISION MAKING. NO MORE PASSING THE BUCK.

IF COUNCIL WERE COMMERCIALY RUN THERE WOULD BE RATES REDUCTIONS OR AT LEAST MONEY TO PAY FOR FAILING INFILSTRUCTURE.

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on



**#22060**



operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22060**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#22060



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#22060



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



**#22060**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22093**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



**#22093**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.



**#22093**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and



**#22093**



back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22093



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#22093



<p>from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#22093**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22096**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22096**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22096**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22096**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22096



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22096



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).





**#22177**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



**#22177**



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**



**#22177**



Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



**#22177**



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



**#22177**



Super City!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22177



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22177



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22177**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22189**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22189**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22189**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22189**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22189



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22189



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).





**#22226**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22226**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22226**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22226**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22226



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22226



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22234**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.





**#22234**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22234**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22234**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22234



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22234



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the  
Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year



**#22247**



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



**#22247**



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’





**#22247**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital



**#22247**



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22247**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22247



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22247



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22247**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22251**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.





**#22251**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22251**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22251**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22251



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22251



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22269**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled

Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing 1to capital and

infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



**#22269**



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.





**#22269**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled

Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing 1 to capital and

infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



**#22269**



'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22269



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#22269



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22269**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year



**#22288**



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



**#22288**



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’





**#22288**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and



**#22288**



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22288**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22288



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22288



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22288**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22295**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing





**#22295**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22295**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



**#22295**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



**#22295**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#22295



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#22295



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22300**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing





**#22300**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22300**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



**#22300**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



**#22300**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#22300



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#22300



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22317**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.





**#22317**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible

Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and



**#22317**



wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible

Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22317**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#22317



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#22317



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22320**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



**#22320**



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**





**#22320**



Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.



**#22320**



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



**#22320**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22320



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#22320



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22320**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22321**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.





**#22321**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22321**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22321**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22321



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22321



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22325**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22325**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland





**#22325**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22325**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22325



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22325



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year



**#22335**



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



**#22335**



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



**#22335**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital





**#22335**



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22335**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22335



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22335



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22335**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22348**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.



**#22348**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and





**#22348**



wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22348**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#22348



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#22348



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on  
the Mayor's proposed Long-Term



**#22357**



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



**#22357**



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



**#22357**



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland





**#22357**



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



**#22357**



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



**#22357**



Rates, Sensible Spending in our  
Super City!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22357



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#22357



<p>from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#22357**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22363**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public





**#22363**



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.



**#22363**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



**#22363**



'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22363



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22363



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22363**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22377**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.





**#22377**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22377**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22377**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22377



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22377



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22401**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



**#22401**



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.





**#22401**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



**#22401**



'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22401



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22401



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22401**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22403**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's



**#22403**



operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.





**#22403**



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



**#22403**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#22403



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#22403



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#22440



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-



**#22440**



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



**#22440**



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



**#22440**



in our Super City!

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-





**#22440**



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



**#22440**



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#22440**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#22440



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22440



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22442**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22442**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland





**#22442**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22442**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22442



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22442



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



#22448



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22448**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



**#22448**



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.



**#22448**



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**





**#22448**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#22448



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#22448



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22453**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22453**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22453**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22453**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**





#22453



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22453



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22455**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22455**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22455**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22455**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22455



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#22455



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22462**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



**#22462**



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.



**#22462**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



**#22462**



'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22462



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22462



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#22462**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22472**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22472**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22472**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22472**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22472



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22472



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22474**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.



**#22474**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible

Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and



**#22474**



wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible

Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22474**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#22474



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#22474



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#22494



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).





**#22494**



I reject all three options for rate increases – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22494**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate increases – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22494**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22494**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22494



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22494



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22495**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.





**#22495**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22495**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22495**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22495



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22495



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22503**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22503**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland





**#22503**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22503**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22503



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22503



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22515**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



**#22515**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations



**#22515**



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





#22515



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22515



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22515**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22521**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



**#22521**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22521**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



**#22521**



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**





**#22521**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#22521



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#22521



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22525**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



**#22525**



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an

expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing

that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.



**#22525**



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called "traffic calming

measures" (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an

expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing

that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



**#22525**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#22525



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22525



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#22525**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22529**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



**#22529**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations



**#22529**



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22529



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--





#22529



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22529**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22531**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.



**#22531**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the "pay less, get less" option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and



**#22531**



wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22531**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#22531



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	





#22531



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-



**#22537**



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



**#22537**



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



**#22537**



Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways



**#22537**



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



**#22537**



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**



**#22537**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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?**





#22537



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#22537



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22542**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



**#22542**



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22542**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



**#22542**



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22542**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other





#22542



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#22542



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#22542**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22547**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include: VERY IMPORTANTLY -

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22547**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

AND PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE - STOP FRIVOLOUSLY SPENDING OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY WITH ZERO REGARD FOR THE MENTAL AND

FINANCIAL DAMAGE YOUR INCONSIDERATENESS CAUSES. AS THE ADAGE GOES, CUT YOUR SUIT ACCORDING TO YOUR CLOTH.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



**#22547**



This should include: VERY IMPORTANTLY -

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**AND PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE - STOP FRIVOLOUSLY SPENDING OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY WITH ZERO REGARD FOR THE MENTAL AND**

**FINANCIAL DAMAGE YOUR INCONSIDERATENESS CAUSES. AS THE ADAGE GOES, CUT YOUR SUIT ACCORDING TO YOUR CLOTH.**

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**



**#22547**



**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**





#22547



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#22547



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22548**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



**#22548**



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22548**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



**#22548**



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22548**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other





#22548



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#22548



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#22548**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22558**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



**#22558**



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**



**#22558**



Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



**#22558**



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our





**#22558**



Super City!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#22558



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#22558



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#22558**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22561**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22561**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22561**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**





**#22561**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22561



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22561



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22567**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22567**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22567**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22567**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**





#22567



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22567



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22570**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22570**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22570**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22570**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22570



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#22570



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year



**#22591**



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



**#22591**



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



**#22591**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and



**#22591**



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22591**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22591



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--





#22591



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#22591**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22593**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



**#22593**



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase



**#22593**



over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



**#22593**



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**



**#22593**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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?**





#22593



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#22593



<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22598**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



**#22598**



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending

in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**



**#22598**



Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.



**#22598**



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



**#22598**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#22598



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#22598



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#22598**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22626**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22626**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22626**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22626**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**





#22626



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22626



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22641**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



**#22641**



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22641**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



**#22641**



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22641**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other





#22641



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#22641



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#22641**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22658**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22658**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22658**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22658**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**





#22658



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22658



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22659**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



**#22659**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations



**#22659**



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#22659



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22659



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of





**#22659**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22663**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those in the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22663**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those in the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22663**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22663**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22663



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22663



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



**#22673**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



**#22673**



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



**#22673**



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#22673**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on 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:**



#22673



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#22673



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor’s proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).





**#22679**



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



**#22679**



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Dear Auckland Council,



**#22679**



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



**#22679**



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**



**#22679**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other



#22679



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#22679



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#22679**



8. Do you have any other comments?