



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

Written Feedback
Kaipātiki Volume #4

April 2024



Sub #	Organisation Name	Page Number
26399	Manurewa Marlins Rugby League	1048
26403	Auckland Table Tennis Association	1052



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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



#21745



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#21745



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21745



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



#21745



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



#21748



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#21748



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21748



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

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



#21748



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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



#21757



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#21757



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21757



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



#21757



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Other

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

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?



#21769



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 continue council group operation 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?



#21769



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21769



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



#21769



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#21780



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:



#21780



4c. If the council group continues to operate the 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.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#21780



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



#21780



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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



#21784



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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



#21784



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21784



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



#21784



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Other

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

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	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?



#21788



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 continue council group operation 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?



#21788



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21788



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



#21788



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



#21790



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#21790



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



#21790



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

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



#21790



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



#21791



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#21791



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



#21791



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

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



#21791



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21794



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?



#21794



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21794



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

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



#21794



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



#21803



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:

Because of not understanding the situation

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

Because of not understanding the situation

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

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

Tell us here:



#21803



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21803



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



#21803



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



#21809



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

not understanding the situation

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

not understanding the situation

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

not understanding the situation



#21809



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

not understanding the situation

4d. Do you have 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:

not understanding the situation

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21809



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



#21809



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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



#21812



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Public Transport

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#21812



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21812



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



#21812



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



#21814



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?



#21814



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21814



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

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



#21814



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Unemployment benefits should be given to those who truly need them, reducing long-term dependency on benefits



#21816



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:



#21816



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?

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21816



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



#21816



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21856



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#21856



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21856



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



#21856



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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



#21952



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:



#21952



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#21952



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



#21952



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

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

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21960



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?

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:



#21960



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21960



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for 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	
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21965



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#21965



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21965



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

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



#21965



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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 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?



#21967



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?

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:



#21967



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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#21967



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



#21967



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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



#21972



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

traffic

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#21972



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#21972



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



#21972



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



#21976



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#21976



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



#21976



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

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



#21976



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	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?



#22012



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?

Other

Tell us why:

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

Other

Tell us why:

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

Other

Tell us 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



#22012



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Other

Tell us why:

Why not just sell it off.

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

Other

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22012



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



#22012



Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?

The increase of rates is too much.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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



#22016



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Public transport

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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



#22016



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22016



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



#22016



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?

Strictly publish those barking dogs.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#22030



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:

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



#22030



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22030



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

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

Do not even understand what it is about.



#22030



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



#22035



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:

Don't sell chicken that could give birth to eggs.

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

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

Tell us here:



#22035



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22035



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



#22035



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

Local board priorities

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

Kaipātiki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



#22037



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:



#22037



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#22037



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



#22037



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

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

Your feedback

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



#22038



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

What is a majority?

2a. Is there anything you 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:

How many funds managers and how much do they earn per year?

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

Other

Tell us here:

What if the Auckland Port is going to move to Northland in the future?



#22038



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?

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.	Other
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Other



#22038



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



#22038



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#22098



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Pay some much-needed attention to the north shore and its ageing Infrastructure and make a decision on harbour crossing. Gosh the Japanese would

have it completed all in a couple of months. Even the Damage done my Gabriel. TO MUCH HUI/Kai and NOT ENOUGH DOEY definitely no action or



#22098



never an agreed outcome, just more meetings

South Auckland has everything they need now, free buses, trains swimming pools reaction parks, skate parks water park, beautiful roads. sports and

concert stadiums, rainbows end., Wero water park stadiums. & major hectare botanical garden as tourist attraction. Equipped play grounds in majority of

neighbourhoods

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

Pay some much-needed attention to the north shore and its ageing Infrastructure and make a decision on harbour crossing. Gosh the Japanese would

have it completed all in a couple of months. Even the Damage done my Gabriel. TO MUCH HUI/Kai and NOT ENOUGH DOEY definitely no action or

never an agreed outcome, just more meetings

South Auckland has everything they need now, free buses, trains swimming pools reaction parks, skate parks water park, beautiful roads. sports and

concert stadiums, rainbows end., Wero water park stadiums. & major hectare botanical garden as tourist attraction. Equipped play grounds in majority of

neighbourhoods

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22098



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



#22098



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22098



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22110



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.



#22110



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



#22110



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)?



#22110



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:



#22110



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22110



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22127



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.



#22127



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



#22127



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)?



#22127



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:



#22127



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22127



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22154



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.



#22154



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



#22154



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!'

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#22154



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22154



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22154



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22154



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22175



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.



#22175



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



#22175



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)?



#22175



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:



#22175



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22175



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22186



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 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?



#22186



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.



#22186



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

Tell us here:



#22186



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



#22186



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

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



#22186



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22188



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.



#22188



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



#22188



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)?



#22188



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:



#22188



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22188



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22236



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.



#22236



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



#22236



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)?



#22236



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:



#22236



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22236



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22239



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



#22239



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).



#22239



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



#22239



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?



#22239



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:



#22239



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22239



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22248



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 😞😞👤👤👤👤👤 - especially the numbers on six figure salaries], 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 - [FOOLS AT BEST]. 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.



#22248



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



#22248



wasteful spending 😞 😞 👤 👤 👤 👤 👤 - especially the numbers on six figure salaries],
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 - [FOOLS AT BEST]. 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!



#22248



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22248



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22248



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22248



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#22263



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



#22263



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!’



#22263



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



#22263



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.



#22263



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?



#22263



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#22263



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



#22263



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22264



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



#22264



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).



#22264



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



#22264



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?



#22264



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:



#22264



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22264



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#22265



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



#22265



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!’



#22265



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



#22265



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.



#22265



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?



#22265



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

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



#22265



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



#22265



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22293



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.



#22293



- 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,



#22293



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



#22293



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?



#22293



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22293



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22293



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22293



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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,



#22296



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:



#22296



- 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?



#22296



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.



#22296



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!’



#22296



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22296



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

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



#22296



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

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



#22296



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22307



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.



#22307



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



#22307



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?



#22307



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22307



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22307



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22310



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



#22310



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?



#22310



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:



#22310



- 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



#22310



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:



#22310



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

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



#22310



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

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



#22310



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22314



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.



#22314



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



#22314



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)?



#22314



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:



#22314



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22314



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22361



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.



#22361



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



#22361



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)?



#22361



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:



#22361



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22361



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#22452



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. The average ratepayer is already struggling with everyday cost of living expenses and any increases in rates would push most people over the edge.

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



#22452



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, pedestrian crossings that cost



#22452



unbelievable amounts of money etc) 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.



#22452



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. The average
ratepayer is already
struggling with everyday
cost of living expenses and
any increases in rates
would push most people



#22452



over the edge.

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



#22452



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, pedestrian crossings that cost unbelievable amounts of money etc) 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.



#22452



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:



#22452



2a. Is there anything you 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:

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



#22452



Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22452



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22478



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.

I FURTHER CALL ON COUNCIIL TO SELL THE REMAINING SHARES IN AUCKLAND AIRPORT! Also use the funds realised to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#22478



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 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.



#22478



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 FURTHER CALL ON COUNCIL TO SELL THE REMAINING SHARES IN AUCKLAND AIRPORT! Also use the funds realised 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



#22478



Tell us 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?



#22478



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



#22478



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22536



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.



#22536



- 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,



#22536



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



#22536



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?



#22536



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22536



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22536



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22536



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22550



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 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.



#22550



I have noticed that roads in Titiwai and Miraka Place are being resurfaced when they are already in OK condition, while other roads in Kaipatiki have unacceptable dips and bumps - there is something wrong in priorities - and I believe this is a feature of council waste.

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:



#22550



- 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 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 have noticed that roads in Titiwai and Miraka Place are being resurfaced when they are already in OK condition, while other roads in Kaipatiki have

unacceptable dips and bumps - there is something wrong in priorities - and I believe this is a feature of council waste.

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?



#22550



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:



#22550



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22550



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22557



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



#22557



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?



#22557



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:



#22557



- 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



#22557



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:



#22557



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

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



#22557



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

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



#22557



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22589



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.



#22589



- 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,



#22589



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



#22589



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?



#22589



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22589



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22589



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22589



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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-



#22609



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



#22609



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



#22609



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-



#22609



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



#22609



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



#22609



Tell us 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?



#22609



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



#22609



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22615



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



#22615



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.



#22615



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?



#22615



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:



#22615



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22615



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22625



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 (as promised) 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.



#22625



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 (as

promised) 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



#22625



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)?



#22625



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:



#22625



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22625



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22668



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.



#22668



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



#22668



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)?



#22668



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:



#22668



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22668



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#22672



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



#22672



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!’



#22672



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



#22672



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



#22672



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:



#22672



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

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

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



#22672



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



#22672



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22680



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.



#22680



- 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,



#22680



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



#22680



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?



#22680



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22680



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22680



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#22680



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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-



#22707



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



#22707



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



#22707



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



#22707



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



#22707



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:



#22707



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



#22707



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22707



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22744



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



#22744



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).



#22744



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



#22744



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?



#22744



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:



#22744



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22744



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#22804



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#22804



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.



#22804



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



#22804



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)?



#22804



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:



#22804



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#22804



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23033



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.



#23033



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



#23033



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)?



#23033



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:



#23033



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23033



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23065



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.



#23065



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



#23065



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)?



#23065



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:



#23065



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23065



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23161



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



#23161



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?



#23161



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:



#23161



- 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



#23161



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:



#23161



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



#23161



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

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



#23161



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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-



#23170



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



#23170



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.



#23170



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.



#23170



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



#23170



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?



#23170



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:

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



#23170



Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23170



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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-



#23294



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



#23294



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



#23294



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-



#23294



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



#23294



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



#23294



Tell us 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?



#23294



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



#23294



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#23354



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.



#23354



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



#23354



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



#23354



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



#23354



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.



#23354



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?



#23354



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#23354



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

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



#23354



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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-



#23372



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



#23372



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



#23372



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



#23372



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.



#23372



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



#23372



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:



#23372



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



#23372



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23372



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23374



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



#23374



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).



#23374



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



#23374



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?



#23374



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:



#23374



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23374



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#23413



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



#23413



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!’



#23413



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



#23413



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.



#23413



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?



#23413



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#23413



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

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



#23413



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23425



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.



#23425



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



#23425



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)?



#23425



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:



#23425



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23425



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23478



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.



#23478



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



#23478



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)?



#23478



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:



#23478



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23478



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#23649



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23649



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.



#23649



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



#23649



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)?



#23649



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:



#23649



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23649



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#23715



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



#23715



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.



#23715



- 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



#23715



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



#23715



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



#23715



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



#23715



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



#23715



Tell us 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?



#23715



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



#23715



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23743



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.



#23743



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



#23743



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)?



#23743



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:



#23743



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23743



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#23802



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



#23802



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!’



#23802



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



#23802



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.



#23802



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?



#23802



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#23802



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

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



#23802



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23823



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



#23823



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).



#23823



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



#23823



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?



#23823



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:



#23823



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23823



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#23909



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#23909



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.



#23909



- 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,



#23909



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



#23909



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?



#23909



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#23909



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#23909



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

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

Local board priorities

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



#23909



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#24253



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



#24253



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!’



#24253



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



#24253



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.



#24253



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?



#24253



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#24253



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

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



#24253



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

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

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#24287



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,



#24287



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



#24287



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



#24287



the Mayor's proposed “

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



#24287



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-



#24287



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



#24287



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 “

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#24287



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#24287



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



#24287



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

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



#24287



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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,



#24391



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:



#24391



- 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?



#24391



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.



#24391



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!’



#24391



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#24391



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



#24391



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

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



#24391



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24408



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#24408



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!'



#24408



Mayor Wayne Brown I supported you at the last elections for Mayor as you promised and I believed that you were going to drive down the rates bill for rate payers. This does not seem to have happened. The Council expenditures appears unbelievable. It seems easy for the Coucil to hike up rates at the drop of a hat. As rate payers we feel helpless. Let me show you how the annual rates has balooned for us on my property.

2021 \$2679.78

2022 \$2822.18

2023 \$3549.96

2024 \$3905.46

It is my sincere hope that you will address this soon.

Kind regards

Anthony Raj

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.



#24408



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!’

Mayor Wayne Brown I supported you at the last elections for Mayor as you promised and I believed that you were going to drive down the rates bill for rate payers. This does not seem to have happened. The Council expenditures appears unbelievable. It seems easy for the Council to hike up rates at the drop of a hat. As rate payers we feel helpless. Let me show you how the annual rates has ballooned for us on my property.

2021 \$2679.78

2022 \$2822.18

2023 \$3549.96

2024 \$3905.46

It is my sincere hope that you will address this soon.



#24408



Kind regards

Anthony Raj

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#24408



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



#24408



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



#24408



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24428



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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



#24428



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



#24428



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!’



#24428



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



#24428



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.



#24428



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?



#24428



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

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



#24428



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

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



#24428



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24448



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#24448



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



#24448



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?



#24448



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:



#24448



- 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



#24448



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:



#24448



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



#24448



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

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



#24448



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24492



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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,



#24492



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:



#24492



- 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?



#24492



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.



#24492



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!’



#24492



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#24492



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



#24492



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

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



#24492



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24498



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#24498



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.



#24498



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



#24498



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)?



#24498



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:



#24498



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24498



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#24617



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.



#24617



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



#24617



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)?



#24617



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:



#24617



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24617



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24658



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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).



#24658



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.



#24658



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



#24658



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)?



#24658



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:



#24658



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24658



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

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

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24680



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24680



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.



#24680



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



#24680



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)?



#24680



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:



#24680



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#24680



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24694



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24694



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.



#24694



Why the Government does not bring in a WEALTH TAX or a CAPITAL GAINS TAX I cannot understand. We are a small country with a thinly spread population, and we need infrastructure!!.....BUT NOT MORE ROADS!!!!

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:



#24694



- 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.

Why the Government does not bring in a WEALTH TAX or a CAPITAL GAINS TAX I cannot understand. We are a small country with a thinly spread

population, and we need infrastructure!!.....BUT NOT MORE ROADS!!!!

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?



#24694



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:



#24694



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#24694



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24737



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.



#24737



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



#24737



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?



#24737



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#24737



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#24737



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24762



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.



#24762



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



#24762



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)?



#24762



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:



#24762



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#24762



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24812



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.



#24812



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



#24812



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)?



#24812



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:



#24812



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#24812



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24922



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.



#24922



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



#24922



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



#24922



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



#24922



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



#24922



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:



#24922



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#24922



<p>from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#24922



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24930



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24930



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



#24930



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



#24930



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



#24930



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.



#24930



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



#24930



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”



#24930



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?



#24930



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:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#24930



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	



#24930



<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25015



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 the 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.

- Cancelling expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” such as the unnecessary speed humps, many

of which do not comply with government regulations, by Auckland Transport. It is likely that some of this money is being diverted from road

maintenance and/or repairs.

- Cancelling expenditure on the street level cellphone towers which are being placed extensively along traffic corridors (Onewa Road being a prime

example) without consultation.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins (many of which have been removed from shopping

areas and reserves since 2023), and weekly rubbish and annual inorganic rubbish collections.



#25015



I largely endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and 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 the 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.



#25015



- Cancelling expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” such as the unnecessary speed humps, many of which do not comply with government regulations, by Auckland Transport. It is likely that some of this money is being diverted from road maintenance and/or repairs.
- Cancelling expenditure on the street level cellphone towers which are being placed extensively along traffic corridors (Onewa Road being a prime example) without consultation.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins (many of which have been removed from shopping areas and reserves since 2023), and weekly rubbish and annual inorganic rubbish collections.

I largely endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and 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:



#25015



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25015



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#25015



<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25042



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25042



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



#25042



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!’



#25042



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



#25042



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.



#25042



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?



#25042



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
--	--



#25042



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25042



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25132



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



#25132



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?



#25132



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:



#25132



- 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



#25132



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:



#25132



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	



#25132



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#25132



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25135



I also reject the idea to do fortnightly rubbish collections we need to continue weekly , we pay for this ontop of our rates

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



#25135



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!’



#25135



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 also reject the idea to do fortnightly rubbish collections we need to continue weekly , we pay for this ontop of our rates

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



#25135



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.



#25135



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?



#25135



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25135



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25135



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25136



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.



#25136



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



#25136



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)?



#25136



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:



#25136



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25136



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25196



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



#25196



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 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



#25196



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.



#25196



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



#25196



Tell us 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#25196



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#25196



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25235



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.



#25235



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



#25235



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 –



#25235



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



#25235



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:



#25235



2a. Is there anything you 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:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#25235



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#25235



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25258



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.



#25258



- 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,



#25258



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



#25258



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?



#25258



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#25258



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to	



#25258



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#25258



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25276



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 and

unnecessary re-construct walking path of many roads) 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



#25276



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.

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.



#25276



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps and unnecessary re-construct walking path of many roads) 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?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:



#25276



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25276



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#25276



<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25311



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.



#25311



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



#25311



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)?



#25311



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:



#25311



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25311



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25345



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



#25345



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



#25345



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.



#25345



- 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:



#25345



2a. Is there anything you 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:



#25345



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#25345



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25401



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.



#25401



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



#25401



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



#25401



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



#25401



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



#25401



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



#25401



Tell us 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#25401



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#25401



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25482



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!'



#25482



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



#25482



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?



#25482



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25482



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25482



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25506



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,



#25506



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



#25506



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?



#25506



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



#25506



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



#25506



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



#25506



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:



#25506



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#25506



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#25506



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25567



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.



#25567



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



#25567



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)?



#25567



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:



#25567



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25567



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25595



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!'



#25595



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



#25595



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?



#25595



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25595



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25595



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25630



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 reducing money spent on operations and staffing, to be re-allocated 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



#25630



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 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 reducing money spent on operations and staffing, to be re-allocated to capital and infrastructure



#25630



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.



#25630



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



#25630



Tell us 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#25630



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#25630



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25654



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



#25654



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 do not 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



#25654



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-



#25654



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 do not support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#25654



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



#25654



Tell us 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?



#25654



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25654



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25675



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



#25675



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!’



#25675



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



#25675



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.



#25675



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?



#25675



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25675



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#25675



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25687



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



#25687



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!’



#25687



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



#25687



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.



#25687



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?



#25687



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25687



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25687



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25769



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



#25769



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?



#25769



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:



#25769



- 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



#25769



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:



#25769



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	



#25769



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#25769



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25781



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 over staffing 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 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,



#25781



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 over staffing 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 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?



#25781



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#25781



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#25781



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25797



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



#25797



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?



#25797



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:



#25797



- 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



#25797



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:



#25797



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 **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value



#25797



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#25797



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25843



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.



#25843



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



#25843



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)?



#25843



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:



#25843



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25843



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

To the Auckland Council,

This is my feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).



#25851



I reject the proposed rate increases – the most expensive of which would be a shocking 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its wasteful spending considering the current economic circumstances facing ratepayers.

This should include:

A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address overstaffing and the obscenely high salaries of council managers.

Pausing expensive and unnecessary works such as unnecessary speed humps and instead fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

Provide only core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

Sensible infrastructure policies. I support Mayor Brown's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an 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 also endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25851



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?

To the Auckland Council,

This is my feedback on the Mayor's proposed
Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject the proposed rate increases – the most
expensive of which would be a shocking 38%
increase over three years. Rates should be limited
to inflation and the Council should cut its wasteful
spending considering the current economic
circumstances facing ratepayers.

This should include:

A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an
independent review has been taken to address
overstaffing and the obscenely high salaries of
council managers.

Pausing expensive and unnecessary works such
as unnecessary speed humps and instead fix
roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

Provide only core council services such as
effective waste management, public bins, and



#25851



weekly rubbish collection.

Sensible infrastructure policies. I support Mayor Brown's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an 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 also 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:



#25851



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25851



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#25851



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25869



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



#25869



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!’



#25869



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



#25869



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.



#25869



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?



#25869



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25869



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25869



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25898



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



#25898



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!’



#25898



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



#25898



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.



#25898



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?



#25898



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#25898



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#25898



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25909



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.



#25909



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



#25909



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)?



#25909



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:



#25909



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25909



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25916



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



#25916



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



#25916



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-



#25916



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



#25916



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



#25916



Tell us 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?



#25916



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25916



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25974



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.



#25974



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



#25974



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)?



#25974



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:



#25974



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#25974



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25982



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.



#25982



I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

Kind Regards

Dieter

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:



#25982



- 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!’

Kind Regards

Dieter

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?



#25982



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:



#25982



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#25982



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25992



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.



#25992



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



#25992



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



#25992



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



#25992



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.



#25992



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?



#25992



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
--	--



#25992



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25992



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25994



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25994



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



#25994



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



#25994



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



#25994



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.



#25994



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



#25994



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:



#25994



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25994



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#25994



<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#26043



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#26043



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, as really hard to make ends meet been single and on the pension

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



#26043



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.



#26043



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



#26043



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. as really hard to make ends meet been single and on the pension

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



#26043



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.



#26043



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?



#26043



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:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#26043



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	



#26043



<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#26086



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#26086



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



#26086



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!’



#26086



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



#26086



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.



#26086



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?



#26086



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
---	--



#26086



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#26086



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes 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: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#26231



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.



#26231



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



#26231



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!' Whatever happens the port should be moved so the water front be used to give our city some real international appeal, by turning the entire water front into a vibrant and exciting social hub that draws people into it and provides a wealth of food and entertainment.

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).



#26231



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:



#26231



- 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



#26231



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!' Whatever happens the port should be moved so the water front be used to give our city some real international appeal, by turning the entire water front into a vibrant and exciting social hub that draws people into it and provides a wealth of food and entertainment.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#26231



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#26231



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	



#26231



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#26236



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.



#26236



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



#26236



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)?



#26236



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:



#26236



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#26236



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#26244



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26244



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

- I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community
- I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which may include changing the Operational Management, exploring redevelopment opportunities.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:



#26244



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#26244



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland.



#26244



Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council’s support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council’s Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

I specifically support the proposed multi-code indoor facility at the Albany Tennis Park in Oteha Valley Road. The reasons for this support are as follows:

The land is currently under-utilised. A multi-code indoor facility at Albany Tennis Park and indoor sports facilities are desperately needed 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: Kaipātiki

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?



#26256



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

- I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community
- I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which may include changing the Operational Management, exploring redevelopment opportunities.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:



#26256



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#26256



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#26256



8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

I specifically support the proposed multi-code indoor facility at the Albany Tennis Park in Oteha Valley Road. The reasons for this support are as follows: We believe that the Auckland Council should allocate funds to this multi-code facility as a matter of urgency



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26320



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26320



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#26320



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities - Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.



#26320



Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment - without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation - improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.



#26320



I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.

The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

- a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)
- b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26321



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26321



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#26321



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities - Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.



#26321



Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment - without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation - improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.



#26321



I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.

The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

- a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)
- b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built and there is clear evidence that such facilities provide a broad range of benefits to the wider community. This includes but is not limited to improved physical and mental health, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes



#26345



I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.

The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region: a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club) b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#26345



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the 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:



#26345



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#26345



<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. Our sector plays a critical role in making Auckland a great place to be now and in the future. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities - Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreational facilities, and your continued support and investment in this growing sport would be greatly appreciated. Auckland Council's commitment to the sector has provided a number of positive outcomes across the region for a more inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I therefore wish to acknowledge the contributions which Auckland Council has made towards the sport and recreation sector.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.



#26345



I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26383



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I am Chair of Harbour Rugby and part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Having suitable recreational facilities in the North Harbour region is critical for our community

to engage with sport and build a strong connection to our community.

The stadium was developed by the North Shore Community for the growing then and now

faster growing area. It is critical it is retained and further developed and not cannibalised for

the benefit of other areas.

This precinct is the most organised in terms of noise and light management from neighbours.

It has a high level of hospitality infrastructure around it.

Users who do hire it praise it but say they are actively discouraged from hiring from

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community, developing the current stadium precinct utilising the main Grandstand structure whilst



#26383



also developing the perimeter field enclosure to create a more appropriate stadium with ambience should that be the best solution. In the meantime the bank removed for the failed Tuatara baseball Franchise needs to be closed off and preferably reinstated.

- A stadium would ideally be able to deliver a mixed use of content such as sport fixture for 8-10K spectators should the need arise, but also have the capability to host functions, corporate lunches, events etc. utilising the current infrastructure already established on the grounds with the current Grandstand facility.
- I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which definitely should include changing the Operational Management and exploring redevelopment opportunities.
- Improved government with representation from users is required.

It is important to have quality facilities in the North Harbour region which encourage activity

both in the sport and recreation sector but also an offering of facilities to host events and

business activities which contribute to regional GDP growth.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:



#26383



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	



#26383



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#26383



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

It is important to have quality facilities in the North Harbour region which encourage activity

both in the sport and recreation sector but also an offering of facilities to host events and

business activities which contribute to regional GDP growth.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

3

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better

outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I am supporting the following aspects of the consultation:

I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.

I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.

I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community

sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.

I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.

I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to

enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development



#26383



contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.

I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.

I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the codevelopment

of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26387



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

- I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community
- I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which may include changing the Operational Management, exploring redevelopment opportunities.
- I support the re-purposing of the stadium to a multi facet sports and recreation 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?



#26387



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to	



#26387



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#26387



8. Do you have any other comments?

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play,

active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better

outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.

I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.

I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community

sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.

I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.

I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to

enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.

I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.

I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the codevelopment

of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport



#26387



and recreation facilities.

I specifically support the proposed multi-code indoor facility at the Albany Tennis Park in

Oteha Valley Road. The reasons for this support are as follows:

* Indoor Sporting competitions are constantly negatively affected by a lack of indoor court space. This is despite the immense year-on-year growth in sports such as basketball among school aged youth.

* Traditional sports such as rugby are decreasing in patronage. These sport fields can be rationalised and sold or leased to fund indoor sporting courts.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26390



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26390



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#26390



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland.



#26390



Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council’s support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

I specifically support the proposed multi-code indoor facility at the Albany Tennis Park in Oteha Valley Road.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Manurewa Marlins Rugby League

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?



#26399



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

The North harbour community need a stadium for sport and entertainment that is run efficiently for the public to enjoy too

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#26399



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#26399



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#26403



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Auckland Table Tennis Association

Local Board: Kaipātiki

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?

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation - improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes. I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-



#26403



purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#26403



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to	



#26403



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#26403



8. Do you have any other comments?

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities - Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment - without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.



#26403



More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation - improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.

I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.

The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

- a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)
- b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.